

THE CALCUTTA JOURNAL

VOL. V.]

General Summary of News.

[No. 184.]

The strong feeling of interest which we observe, both from the tone of society, and from the intimations of friendly Correspondents, to prevail generally with regard to the great Question of the Catholic Claims, has induced us to abridge considerably our notices of local matters, and to postpone the communications of several of our Friends, in order to give the Debate in the House of Commons at length—and we shall follow it up to-morrow by the Debate on the same subject in the House of Lords—after which we shall resume the regular series.

The *precis* which we have already given of the general heads of European intelligence brought by the last arrivals, will render our omission of articles from that quarter of less consequence.

We may mention here a fact, which has been known in private circles in town for several days, but which has not yet been made public, namely that the H. C. ship *Carnatic*, on her voyage to this place, spoke an American vessel, having the appearance of one of the Independent cruizers, which bore down to her for medical assistance; having several sick on board, and that she communicated to the *Carnatic*, the intelligence of Lord Cochrane having made his projected attack on Lima, and met with a complete defeat, suffering a severe loss among some of his best officers and men. What credit may be due to this statement we are not prepared to say, but we state the channel through which it has been received.

The following intelligence from the Cape of Good Hope is of a later date than any thing we have seen from that quarter, and is conveyed through the Bombay Courier, from Cape Town Gazettes received at that Presidency, and dated June 15, 1819.

CAPE.

By recent advices from Graham's Town, it appears that every thing there is proceeding quietly, and that Lt. Col. Wiltshire's arrangements are in as much forwardness as the circumstances of the season could have given reason to expect. The Commando from the Cape District marched to Junction Drift on the 24th of last month: Junction Drift is so called from the Post being situated near the spot where the Little Fish River falls into the large stream of that name. The Horses of this Detachment are reported to be in very good order. The Stellenbosch Commando arrived at Graham's Town on the 15th May, but their Horses were much fatigued and very poor.

The Caffers had been for some days perfectly quiet, but on the 8th of last month they shewed themselves, in considerable force, at the Upper Caffer Drift Post, which they surrounded and attacked. Captain Birch, of the Royal African Corps, (who estimates their number at between 3 and 4000,) received them so warmly, that they were not disposed to persist in the attempt to carry the Post, and after skirmishing for about an hour, he drove them off, with considerable slaughter. We had one man slightly wounded in this affair. This Post is situated on a high bank of the Fish River, about 12 miles from its embouchure; it commands one of the principal Fords used by the Caffers in their incursions into the Zureveld.

Detachments of the 38th and 54th Regiments have sailed to reinforce the Army on the Frontier.

Calcutta.—On Monday last, pursuant to public notice, a Meeting of the Directors and Members of the "Bengal Provident Society," was convened at the Office of Messrs. Palmer and Co., when the Secretary exhibited the accounts of the Three First Classes, made up to the 30th of June last; and the Treasurer produced the Company's Paper, amounting to nearly Four (4) Lacs of Sicca Rupees.

Mr. King's Report on the state of the Funds demonstrated, that from the establishment of the First of these Societies, to the present period, they had improved at a ratio of Nine (9) per Cent. per annum, after defraying every item of expence, without including the number of casualties in the calculations.

The greater part of the Funds, having been invested when the Company's Paper bore a heavy Discount, added to the 12 per Cent. charged upon Premiums for Shares, taken late during the first year of operation, (which rule is observed in every class,) is the cause of this favorable report of the Society's affairs.

The accounts having passed audit, and received the signatures of approval from the Directors, it was resolved to grant Loans for 9 to 10 per cent. Interest, (the latter payable half yearly,) for a term of one to three years, where the security tendered was proved to be admissible.

The Secretary having reported a death vacancy in the Direction, on the motion of Mr. Palmer, Mr. Henry Mathew was unanimously chosen to fill the Office in the room of the late Alexander Colvin, Esq. when the Meeting adjourned.

In the Letter of Captain HORSBURGH, addressed to Captain G. NICHOLLS of this Port, and published in our Journal of Wednesday last, mention was made of the publication of a Letter in the *Asiatic Journal* of the month in which that Letter was dated. This date is specified as the 1st of June; and as the Ship, by which it came, left England on the 24th of May, it was naturally thought to have been an error, of June for May. The *Asiatic Journal* for May is in our possession, but does not contain the Letter in question; and it was no doubt reserved for the June Number. We mention this principally, to account for our delay, as we intended to have given the whole Correspondence together, which we must now give incomplete.

The following is a revised List of the Commanders included in the Letter addressed by Captain HORSBURGH to Captain GEORGE NICHOLLS, as published in our Journal of Wednesday last.

CAPTAINS.	SHIPS.	CAPTAINS.	SHIPS.
Riddoch, ... Ann,	of Bombay.	Duncan, ... Lady Sophia,	Beng.
Seton, ... Lowjee Family,	ditto.	Hudson, ... Barretto Junior,	do.
Suxpitch, ... Sulimany,	ditto.	Dobie, ... Mysore,	ditto.
Finny, ... Asia,	ditto.	Briggs, ... Castlereagh,	Bomb.
Stevenson, ... Charlotte,	ditto.	Gover, ... Glenelg,	ditto.
Cooper, ... Cumbrian,	ditto.	Richardson, ... Helen,	ditto.
Balston, ... Lady Flora,	Bengal.	Graham, ... Cornwallis,	ditto.
Kinsey, ... Maitland,	ditto.	Hammett, ... Shah Byramgore,	do.
Clarke, ... Zenobia,	ditto.	Ross, ... Bannerman,	ditto.
Kidd, ... Juliana,	ditto.		

The following is the Letter before spoken of addressed to Messrs. Colvins, Bazett and Co. of this place.

East India House, June 1, 1819.*

GENTLEMEN,

The Commanders of the Country Trade, who were at Canton in 1818, having voted to me a Piece of Plate, of the value of 150 guineas, in testimony of their approval of my exertions for the improvement of Oriental Navigation, among whom were ten Commanders belonging to Calcutta, by which act they have laid me under great obligations. I am therefore anxious to convince them that I am fully sensible of the honor they have conferred on me, and have taken the liberty to address to you Ten Copies of a Treatise on Marine Surveying, and will be greatly obliged, when opportunity offers, if you can hand a copy of it to each of the following Commanders, viz.

CAPTAINS.	SHIPS.	CAPTAINS.	SHIPS.
Nicholls, ... Philippa.		Hudson, ... Barretto Junior.	
Kinsey, ... Maitland.		Hammett, ... Shah Byramgore.	
Balston, ... Lady Flora.		Finny, ... Asia.	
Dobie, ... Mysore.		Clarke, ... Zenobia.	
Duncan, ... Lady Sophia.		Kidd, ... Juliana.	

Excuse me for giving you this trouble.

I remain, Gentlemen, your obliged,

JAS. HORSBURGH.

Note.—We are requested to state, for the information of those Commanders, whose copies may not have reached them, that they may be had on application to the Secretary at the Exchange.

* It is remarkable that this error of date appears both in the Letter to Captain Nicholls, and in this to Messrs. Colvins, Bazett and Co.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR,—In your Journal of Thursday last you have given place to the Letter of A SOLDIER OF FORTUNE, who has taken up the glove as a champion of the New School, and opens his battery with a learned quotation, which he kindly translates for the benefit of his brothers of the sword.

In his second paragraph, the SOLDIER OF FORTUNE is, methinks, rather out of character:—the daring and rapid career of the aspiring partisan, is suddenly interrupted by a moralizing soliloquy on the vices and defects of mankind, and he at length comes to a conclusion by repeating the old truism: “that merit ought to awaken nothing but emulative admiration.” He endeavors to make it appear that A FRIEND TO THE ARMY is not an advocate for rewarding merit.—But that Writer has explicitly declared himself to the contrary, and only differs as to the means.—The SOLDIER OF FORTUNE would reward “the hero” at the expense of his brave and deserving brother officers.—The FRIEND TO THE ARMY at the expense of government alone.—The former, by rewarding one deserving individual, would irritate the feelings and corrode the lives of hundreds;—the latter would amply reward conspicuous merit, without depriving the great body of Officers of their rights, or wounding the sensibility of any. I have always understood that supercession by Regimental Rank, was considered as *unfortunate*, but I have never heard it called an *hardship*, and it certainly has never created *discontent* or *jealousy*. It may to some be *unfortunate*, but it is a misfortune we had in open view on entering the service; and what renders it of minor consequence, and deprives it of “deadly sting,” is, that such supercession depends not (to use a soft expression) on the fallible or partial judgment of an individual. For although the admired and well-known magnanimity of the present day ensures justice to all, yet who can disclose the future? who can say what may come, when the present great luminary shall have ceased to watch over our honor and our interest? The next paragraph is not pertinent: a man may be allowed to lament his bad fortune, although injustice has not been incurred. Your Correspondent tells us that “the occasional promotion of a junior Officer would not be so great an innovation as some appeared to imagine” and that “in point of fact it might have a *corrective* influence, for a Commanding Officer would thereby be enabled to afford an individual who was in great danger of supercession, an opportunity of gaining that rank by his personal conduct.” In other words, Sir, an Officer in command of a corps or division would be *enabled*, when he saw a probability of success or Brevet promotion, to exert his partiality, and order his friend or favorite on command out of his proper tour of duty, and this possibly in prejudice of an Officer of higher rank and superior abilities: I say abilities, for as to mere courage, I believe few Englishmen are deficient in that article. A man may be brave enough to bolt his head into “the cannon’s mouth”, and yet be incapable of detached duty at the head of even a single company. This may be the school in embryo for the Bengal Army, but I shall bitterly lament the day on which I am whipped into it. We are asked, in the language of triumph, “Can such feelings as these be perverted? Can patronage abuse them? No!—the generous and unerring meed of applause is conferred by the according suffrage and acclaim of our brothers in arms.” Can the SOLDIER OF FORTUNE be serious, or has he been bantering on a serious subject. We are favored with a supposition,—“Suppose a Commander does fix upon his favorite or friend, and, upon trial (from incapacity,) that friend fails, no one could wish to see the experiment repeated, nor is it probable, that it would be.” Why no, not in the person of the individual who failed; but other favorites would arise, with equal, if not superior claims and capabilities: “Hills peep o’er hills, and Alps on Alps arise,”—and can you wonder then when such a degrading, injurious, and cruel system is advocated, if the majority of the Bengal Army, young and old, dislike the very idea of the “New School,” where *Merit by Brevet* would not fail to be corrodingly conspicuous, and where (at some future period) patronage would “From rock to rock with giant bound,” catch all the good things of this world for its favorite offspring, and leave the brave, the modest, and deserving, to bewail in obscurity, the want of great connections, and consequent deprivation of promotion in the New School?—W.—Barrackpore, September 3, 1819.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR,—When I took the liberty to address you on the subject of Brevet promotion, I merely intended to express my opinion on a question which appeared to me fairly proposed for discussion. I did not wish to confute any body, neither did I take the gentleman who espouses the opposite side, for any thing but what he really is, a person who professes to submit his observations to general correction and amendment, but who, in doing so, appeared to me to strike at the foundation of those principles of military feeling which I had ever been taught to revere; and which I presum-

ed to regret, should be repressed, or withdrawn from the contemplation of a true Soldier. Chivalrous I may be, yet I cannot think that an attempt to foster sentiments which are calculated to impress a military man with a respect for himself, and a lively regard for the character of his profession, can either be misplaced or unsuccessful.

Allow me, Sir, to point out a few inaccuracies—or inconsistencies which occur in the remarks made by your Correspondent upon my last address to you. In a former letter he had told us “delicacy of feeling will and does, always prevent a Commanding Officer from sending an old Officer under a (I may say) junior.”—Yet when I ventured to suggest that, by the same kindness and consideration, a deserving Officer in danger of supercession might be presented with an opportunity of distinguishing himself, the gentleman with great vehemence protests against any infringement of the *General Roster*, and says he can hardly figure to himself “any Commanding Officer being guilty of so disgracing and indelicate an act,” and all this too, after he had figured to himself “many Commanding Officers who would for their own benefit so far accord with the view of a Governor General or Commander in Chief, as to extol more than they ought to do, any young Officer who, they might be given to understand, had great interest.”—Really, if seniority, promotion—and the infallibility of the general roster, are to be supported, their advocates may well exclaim “Non tali auxilio, non defensoribus istis!”

In this paragraph too, there is still another misconception besides a false quotation from my letter—he makes me talk of a *particular* friend,—and then goes on to say “if I and he were exactly equal in point of merit”—now I spoke not of *this* equality, but of equality of *Rank*—and yet he will insist upon it that the selection from candidates of equal pretensions is for promotion, whereas this must depend entirely upon the manner in which the individual conducts himself *after* having been selected. This error seems to pervade the whole system of reasoning, not only of your Correspondent, but of most of those who side with him. They assume the mere circumstance of being selected for a particular service, as constituting merit,—when it does but afford the individual in question, an opportunity of shewing whether he really possess any. Chance, therefore, as this gentleman every where industriously insinuates, has in fact as little to do in the business as possible; and perhaps if he give himself the trouble to reflect upon the numbers who have *not* distinguished themselves when they had an opportunity, he will be convinced of his error. On these occasions there is at least one operation of chance which is decidedly against promotion—the chance of being killed in the struggle.

In the same spirit, our friend prophesies that the merit of an Aid-de-Camp will be rewarded (dreadful consummation) just like the merit of any other personage; really, if I had not already shewn that his notions of merit differ materially from those of most folks, I should like to ask him what there is peculiar to the merit of this class of Officers that should cancel its pretension to reward. The gentleman in another place speaks of rewards to those who serve their country elsewhere than in the field of action. I expressly alluded to this class in my letter. He goes on, however, somewhat triumphantly to ask, who is to be judge of their merit?—“who” says he “but the Governor General or Commander in Chief?”—will their merit be granted on the field of action?—Pray did I assert that it would?—I believe not; he has confounded one description of persons with another—and yet, I would ask who was to judge of Colonel Close’s merit in the campaign which terminated with the capture of Seringapatam? His merits were appreciated by “Battalion Officers” and by all Officers; and had the power of granting Brevet promotion been then vested in the local Government, there can be no doubt that the general wish of the Army would have been gratified by his immediate preferment. By arguing too much from the *letter*, your Correspondent has almost every where misconceived the *spirit* of my reasoning; and because I said that is the warmth and exultation of victory, expressions “out of all proportion,” are often made use of, he supposes that rewards must be out of all proportion also, forgetting that for the latter, the standard of comparison is to be found upon the field of battle. The conclusion of his letter will furnish me with an illustration. After informing us that he has been at the plunder both of Towns and Camps before now, he infers that if I am really ignorant of the plundering properties of both Officers and men, I can never have seen a great deal of *hard* service: Now, passing over this singular definition, suppose on one of these occasions of hard service, I were to run up to him and say “My dear fellow, that oblique movement of your’s to get hold of the cash was worthy of the Great Frederick.” Surely this expression at *any other moment* would have been “out of all proportion,” yet would my applause be *unerring* notwithstanding, since nobody could deny him the merit of *collecting more plunder than his neighbours*. The merit of my Hero was, it is true, of a different description, but if I am not very much mistaken they would both be sufficiently conspicuous.

Barrackpore, Sept. 5, 1819.

A SOLDIER OF FORTUNE.

BOMBAY.

We are most happy to comply with the request of our Correspondent, who has obligingly sent us the following for insertion :

"To Brigadier General PRITZLER, Commanding Field Division.

SIR,

"In conformity to your orders to attack the lower Fort of Copal Droog with the forces hereafter mentioned, I marched from the Mortar Battery at noon yesterday with Captain Cuppaidge's party, ordered to escalate the wall to the right of the fort, Captain Smithwait of the Pioneers, and Lieutenant Oliphant of the Engineers leading; the former with a party of his corps carrying scaling ladders, and the latter pointing out our route as we advanced. Captain Tew at the same time advancing to escalate the lower works to the left, and Captain Jones with his party advancing with the view of entering the fort by a gate, or sally port, which was to be blown open.

Captain Cuppaidge's party pushed on at a quick pace as we came near the fort, from which immediately a heavy fire commenced, which occasioned a few casualties, and I am sorry to state Ensign Elliot of the Rifle Corps was killed when getting over the wall from whence we advanced to the second gateway, which communicated with the road to the upper fort.

At this gateway we met with Captain Tew and Captain Jones's parties; the former having entered the fort by escalate, and the latter having come in by the gateway which was blown open by Lieutenant Gregory of the artillery under the direction of Lieutenant Grant of the engineers. The three parties having thus joined at the same spot, and very nearly at the same time, in the manner preconcerted, notwithstanding that mounting the ladders was attended with considerable difficulty, which obliged a party of the column under Captain Cuppaidge to make a detour and come in by the breach.

Captain Cuppaidge's party then ascended and took post in a choultry considerably in advance up the hill, under a fire of matchlocks and considerably annoyed from large stones which were rolled down the rock, one of which wounded Captain Dunn, of the Quarter Master General's department, in the head.

The other two parties were left near the gateway under cover until such time as Captain Jones and a party of his men were required at the choultry on a party being sent in advance, under Lieutenant Silver, with Lieutenant Oliphant of the Engineers.

This party was sent to find "there was any cover for our troops farther up the hill, and they found imperfect cover for a small party near a gateway, and after some time the gateway was forced open. The conduct of Lieut. Silver, who was wounded on this occasion, was highly meritorious, and I beg leave to bring it particularly to your notice.

I am sorry to add that Lieutenant Taylor of H. M. 22d Dragoons was severely wounded at this post, when displaying the greatest gallantry; and some of the party were killed and wounded.

From this, after much exertion, a party of Europeans ascended to another gateway, when, after a good deal of firing, the Killadar's party hoisted a white flag, and demanded terms: and the Killadar after much hesitation came out and delivered himself up, on my assuring him at the gateway (he being on the top of the wall,) his life should be spared, and his whole garrison surrendered at the same time.

As you were an eye witness of our proceedings, it is almost unnecessary for me to add that the conduct of all the troops was admirable in a service which was both arduous and extremely fatiguing.

I cannot, however, close my report without stating that the conduct of Captain Tew of the 34th regiment, Captain Cuppaidge of the 53d regiment, and Captain Jones of the 69th regiment, merits the greatest praise, they having acted with the greatest gallantry, activity and zeal. The like praise is also due to Captain Green commanding a detachment of the 12th Regiment Native Infantry, to Captain Tabois, deputy paymaster, who volunteered to act with his company in the same corps, and to Captain Hall, commanding a detachment of the rifle corps.

The gallant and zealous exertions of Lieutenant Grant and Lieutenant Oliphant, of the Engineers, were most conspicuous, both in advancing, and wherever their presence was required. The same remark will apply to Captain Smithwait, of the pioneers, Captain Jencour, 69th regiment, Brigade Major, and Captain Dunn, of the Quarter Master General's department.

Mr. Assistant Surgeon Harwood, who accompanied us up the fort, and Mr. Assistant Surgeon Hughes who was stationed below, afforded the most prompt assistance to the wounded.

(Signed) HUGH FRASER, Lt. Col. 2d Batt. 10th Regt. Comdg.

Camp, near Copal Droog, May 14, 1819.

1st Detachment under Captain Tew, 34th regt.

1/2 Company Flank Battalion.

1 Ditto Rifle Corps.

Grenadier Company, 2d battalion 4th regiment.

2d Ditto, 2d battalion 12th regiment.

2d Detachment under Captain Cuppaidge, 53d regiment.

1/2 Company Flank Battalion.

1 Ditto Rifle Corps.

Light ditto, 2d battalion 4th regiment.

1 Ditto, 2d battalion 12th regiment.

Reserve under Captain Jones, 69th regiment.

1 Company Flank.

1 Ditto Rifle Corps.

1 Ditto, 2d battalion 4th regiment.

1 Ditto, 2d battalion 12th regiment.

To Brigadier General PRITZLER, C. B. Commanding Field Force, Doab.

SIR, I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, with its enclosures, which has been submitted to the officer commanding the army in chief.

Lieutenant General Traupaud has derived great satisfaction in observing the success which has attended the troops under your command, in the attack and surrender of Copal Droog. The distinguished merits of the officers and men now brought to the Lieutenant General's notice merit his entire approbation, but as the operations of the Field Force are immediately under the control of the supreme government, Lieutenant General Traupaud does not consider it proper for him to anticipate in General Orders the praises which will no doubt be bestowed by higher authority, he therefore adopts this method of requesting you will be pleased to communicate to the officers and men of the Force under your command the Lieutenant General's admiration of the zeal and decision which actuated them in assaulting and carrying the fort of Copal Droog."

I have the Honor to be, &c. &c. &c.

(Signed) EDWARD SNOW, Dept. Adj. Gen. of the Army.

Adjutant General's Office, Choultry plain, 25th May, 1819.

A True Copy,

By Order, (Signed) J. WATSON, Assist. Adj. Gen. K. T.

MADRAS.

General Orders by Government, Fort St. George, July 3, 1819.

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council having resolved to raise a Corps of Native Infantry for service at the Presidency and its vicinity, to consist of 20 Companies, and to be denominated the Madras Native Militia:—the following Establishment of the Corps is accordingly authorized.

1 Field Officer, Commandant; 1 Captain, Second in Command; 1 Subaltern, Adjutant; 20 Subudars, 20 Jummadars, 100 Havildars, 100 Naicks, 2,000 Sepoys, 20 Drummers and Fifers, 20 Puckallies.

Effective Staff—1 Surgeon, 1 Sergeant Major, 1 Quarter Master Sergeant, 2 First Dressers, 2 Second Do. 1 Vakeel, 4 Toties.

Non-Effective Staff—1 Native Adjutant, 2 Drill Havildars, 2 Drill Naicks, 20 Pay Havildars, 2 Drum and Fife Majors.

Artificers.—1 Mistry, 2 Carpenters, 6 Armourers, 3 Smiths, 3 Hammermen, 3 Bellows Boys, 2 Chickledars, 2 Chucklers,—with allowance of Rupees 10 per month in lieu of materials, for the repair of Arms.

The Madras Native Militia will be formed in part by drafts from the Native Veteran Battalions—Jummadars, selected from these Battalions, are to be appointed to act as Subudars, and will draw the pay and allowances of that rank; and Havildars will be selected, in like manner, to act as Jummadars, with the pay and allowances of that rank.—The Havildars and Naicks are to be appointed from Sepoys of the best characters, who may be drafted from the Veteran Establishment.

The Madras Native Militia will be completed by recruiting at the Presidency.—the Men recruited not to be under 5 feet 2 inches in height, nor under 16 or more than 30 years of age.

The Native Commissioned and Non-commissioned Staff of the Corps, will be furnished from the line.

The Clothing of the Corps is to be provided by the Agent for Army Clothing, under the General Regulations of the Service, for the benefit of the Offreckoning Fund.—The Commandant will draw such allowance for the Offreckonings of the Madras Native Militia, as he may be entitled to under the General Regulations applicable to Extra Corps,—as provided by the 7th Article of the Instructions of the Honorable the Court of Directors, published in General Orders, dated the 8th March 1816.

The Governor in Council is pleased to make the following Appointments—to have effect from the 1st of next month.

Lieutenant Colonel Charles Hodgson of the 22d Native Regiment, to Command the Madras Native Militia.

Captain N. H. Hatherly, to be Second in Command.

Mr. Surgeon Thomas Sergeant, to be Surgeon to the Corps.

July 24, 1819.

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council is pleased to direct, in reference to the General Order dated the 8th ultimo, that the Pay and Allowances of all Ranks of Officers of the Horse Artillery Brigade, shall be the same as those established for corresponding Ranks in the Light Cavalry, to commence from the date of the General Order appointing them to that Corps, and to cease from that of publication of the General Order removing them from it, at the Station where they may be doing duty—of which (date) a Certificate is to accompany the last Abstract for Pay and Allowances drawn under the Head of the Horse Artillery Brigade.

Officers of the Brigade of Horse Artillery, when absent on furlough in Europe, or when appointed by Government to permanent Staff Situations or Commands, are not entitled to Horse Artillery Pay in the one case, or Pay and Allowances in the other.—But temporary Staff Employ or detached duty, is not to deprive them of the Pay and Allowances of the Horse Artillery, while they remain on the strength of that Corps.

The Regulations regarding the Pay and Allowances of Medical Officers doing duty with the Corps of Light Cavalry, to be in all respects applicable to the Brigade of Horse Artillery.

It is to be understood that an Officer when removed from the Horse Artillery Brigade, is not to be required to refund for the broken period of the month, the difference between Foot and Horse Artillery Pay, which he may have drawn in advance for the whole month, in which the removal takes place.

Errata.

The illness of the Printer, and some other minor circumstances not worth explaining, have occasioned of late a more than usual number of Typographical errors in the pages of our Journal.

The article on the Cave Temples of Salsotte, published on Sunday last, has several, most of which may, it is true be corrected by the reader,—as being confined to mis-spelling, bad pointing, &c.

The following, however, as affecting the sense, are necessary to be stated.

In the Poetic Lines on AMATA, published in our Journal of the 22d of August, line 35.

For—"Entranced the Sons of Grief,"
Read—"Entranced the Sons of Greece."

Among the Deaths inserted on the 8th instant, the name of the station or place at which Captain A. Gordon's death occurred, was omitted, from not being legible in the manuscript. It should be Anopshcer, N. E. of Ally Ghur.

At the head of the Parliamentary Debate on Mr. Tierney's Motion for an Enquiry into the State of the Nation, published in our Journal of yesterday—for "House of Lords, May 18, 1818," read "House of Commons, May 18, 1819."

We take this opportunity of repeating our request that those Friends who honor us with written communications for insertion, will have the kindness to let their writing be as distinct as possible, or errors must ensue; as well as, when their communications extend to any length, to confine the writing to one side of the paper only for the convenience and expedition of the Printers.

Civil Appointments.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT, AUGUST 28, 1819.

Mr. E. Sterling to be an Assistant to the Resident for the States of Bundelkund, and Superintendent of the Nerbudda Territories.

Mr. J. Simson, ditto ditto.

Military.

General Orders, by His Excellency the Most Noble the Governor General in Council.

FORT WILLIAM, SEPTEMBER 4, 1819.

The undermentioned Gentlemen having respectively furnished Certificates, Affidavits and Counterpart Covenants of their Appointment as Cadets of Infantry, and Assistant Surgeons on this Establishment, are admitted to the Service accordingly.

Infantry.

Messrs. Hay Macdowall, Joseph Walker, Jasper Ouseley, William Payne, Francis Edward Manning, Charles Farmer, William Beckett, Miles Dormer, Frederick Coape Smith, William Whitaker, William Hickey, Thomas Sewell.

Medical Establishment.

Messrs. James Stewart and Edward Hickman.

The Cadets of Infantry are promoted to the rank of Ensign; leaving the dates of their Commissions for future adjustment.

His Lordship in Council was pleased, in the Political Department, under date the 28th ultimo, to sanction the temporary attachment of Assistant Surgeon Allan to the Mission in Bhopaul, vice Gerard, deceased.

FORT WILLIAM, SEPTEMBER 6, 1819.

Ordered that the following Extract (Paragraph 4 to 7 and 9) from a General Letter from the Honourable the Court of Directors, bearing date the 12th of May 1819, be published in General Orders.

"4.—The undermentioned Officers have our permission, severally to return to their Rank on your Establishment, viz. Captain Francis Dickson, Captain Richard Collier Andree, Captain Robert B. Fulton, and Lieutenant George R. Pemberton.

5.—We have permitted the undermentioned Officers of your Establishment, severally to remain in England until the departure for your Presidency of the first Company's ships of next season 1819-20, viz. Captain Hugh L. Playfair, and Captain Henry Weston.

6.—We have permitted Captain William Hiatt, of your establishment, to remain in Europe until the departure for your Presidency of the first Company's ships of next season 1819-20.

7.—We have permitted Mr. Edward Hickman to proceed to your Presidency to practise as a Surgeon; and we direct that he succeed as an Assistant Surgeon on your Establishment—his rank will be settled at a future time.

9.—We have permitted Mr. John Griffiths to proceed to your Presidency to practise as a Surgeon; and we direct that he succeed as an Assistant Surgeon on your Establishment—his rank will be settled at a future time."

W. CASEMENT, Lieut. Col. Sec. to the Govt. Mil. Dept.

Domestic Occurrences.

MARRIAGE.

On the 8th instant, at St John's Cathedral, by the Rev. Mr. Parsons, Cornelius Cardew, Esq. of the Civil Service, to Miss Martha Masters.

BIRTHS.

On the 8th instant, Mrs. H. A. Elliott, of a Son and Heir.
On the 2nd instant, Mrs. P. Sutherland, of a Son.
At Cawnpore, on the 26th August, the Lady of Major Herbert Brown, of the 20th Native Infantry, of a Son.
At Delhi, on the 3rd of July, Mrs. J. T. Thompson, of a Daughter.
At Hyderabad, the Lady of Lieutenant Charles St. John Grant, Russell's Cavalry, of a Daughter.
At Madras, on the 11th August, the Lady of Colonel Must, of a Daughter.

DEATHS.

At Pultah, on the 5th instant, Philip Brady, Esq. deeply and sincerely lamented by a numerous circle of friends and acquaintances, to whom he was justly endeared by a long intercourse of kindness, and by the many excellent qualities of his head and heart.

On the 6th instant, Amelia, the Wife of Mr. John Henderson, of the Pilot Service, aged 18 years.

On the 31st ultimo, Augusta, the Wife of Mr. David Jones, of the Pilot Service, aged 31 years.

On the 27th ultimo, Mr. Thomas Brown, late a Master in the Pilot Service, aged 47 years.

At Cananore, on the 8th August, Captain J. C. Hardis, of the 1st Batt. 10th Regt. N. I.; greatly regretted by his brother Officers and other Friends.

At Madras, on the 14th August, Jane, the Wife of Mr. Edward Ranken; much and deservedly regretted by a large circle of Relatives and Friends.

At Dindigul, on the 5th August, Major E. P. Stevenson, of the 4th N. V. Bat.

At Cotalium, on the 8th August, Captain W. Biss, of the 24th Regiment N. I.

At Madras, on the 16th August, Anne, the infant Daughter of Lieutenant D. H. Mackenzie, of the Artillery, aged 5 days.

Shipping Intelligence.

CALCUTTA ARRIVALS.

(None.)

CALCUTTA DEPARTURES.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	Destination
Sept.	8 Stanmore	British	W. B. Torlesse	Batavia
	8 Hashmy	British	C. E. Smith	Persian Gulf

CAPE ARRIVALS.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	From whence	Left
May	1 Mulgrave Castle	British	James Ralph	Bombay	Feb. 7
	14 Traveller	British	A. Hutchingson	Bombay	March 7
June	7 Eclipse	British	John Cogill	Bombay	March 27
	7 Neptune	British	R. Carns	Madras	March 15
	8 Nautilus	British	J. F. Chapman	Portsmouth	April 2
	8 Phaeton	British	W. H. Dillon	Madras	April 17
	20 Malabar	British	J. Clavell	Bombay	April 5
	20 Brilliant	British	R. Feun	Calcutta	April 9
	21 Brothers	British	R. Stamp	Batavia	April 18
	23 East Indian	British	R. Hogg	Calcutta	March 21
	24 Ajax	British	W. Clark	Madras	April 11

CAPE DEPARTURES.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	Destination
May	7 Mulgrave Castle	British	J. Ralph	London
	18 Traveller	British	A. Hutchinson	London
	17 Eclipse	British	J. Cogill	Liverpool
	17 Wellington	British	G. Maxwell	Gibraltar
	17 Neptune	British	R. Carns	London
	23 Brothers	British	R. Stamp	London

Commercial Reports.

(FROM THE CALCUTTA EXCHANGE PRICE CURRENT.)

Indigo.—Very little of the new crop has yet arrived, and from the great uncertainty attending it, it is not easy at this early period to form a correct estimate of what may be the extent of it. From the best information however which has yet been obtained, the season has been very favourable in the districts of Purneah, Jungapore, Hoogly, Khisnagur, the west side of Jessore and Natore; and the produce has been abundant. In the districts of Dacca, Jellalpoore and the east side of Ferridpoore, the rains have been unusually heavy and the country was inundated at an early period; in Tirhoot and Benares the season on the contrary has been remarkably dry, and in all these districts the crop from both these causes has suffered considerably. It is too soon yet to speak with certainty of the produce of Oude, but the probability is that the crop on the whole will be fully an average one, say about 85,000 to 90,000 maunds, with a larger proportion than usual of good Indigo.

Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,—MAY 3, 1819.

CATHOLIC CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at a quarter before four o'clock. The House, until half-past five, was principally occupied in receiving Petitions for and against the Catholic Claims.

Mr. GRATTAN then rose and said, that in presenting the Petitions which he had just delivered in at the Table, he was animated by an ardent hope that they would be successful; and that by that success, strength would be imparted to the Protestant Establishment, to the Protestant Church, and to the Protestant succession, as by law established. Nothing could more effectually tend to the attainment of this desirable object than the identification of the Catholic and the Protestant interest. Such an identification would indeed increase the general force of the empire. It was his most ardent wish, that the members of two religions, bearing the strongest similitude to each other; having the same origin, and in many respects the same creed and the same ordinances, should be closely united under the common rule of the British Empire for their mutual benefit; that different voices should join in one chorus, with the variety of nature, but with her concord also [hear, hear!] He begged the House to observe, that the Petitions which had been presented from the Roman Catholics, requested to be freed from disqualifications imposed on them merely because they would not abjure their religion [hear, hear!] Their claims were not of a fantastic character. Of such demands they steered clear; as on the other hand they concurred in their common right to the same eligibility as their fellow citizens, under the controul of the same Legislature. If Parliament still incapacitated them, they would deny them the benefit to be derived from former concessions. The Legislature had a right to impose on the Catholics a penal sentence if they were delinquent; but it was bound in justice and in duty to establish their delinquency before it called on them to establish their innocence [hear, hear, hear!] The Catholics submitted to the consideration of the House, that, in common with their fellow-subjects, they had a right to seats in Parliament, and to fill the various offices of the State; for that the great causes of their original disqualification had ceased.—The first of these causes was the combination of the Catholics of Europe; the existence of the Pretender was another; the power of the Pope was a third. All these causes had ceased. The combination of the Catholics of Europe was no more; the Pretender was no more; the power of the Pope was no more. The Catholics by no means denied the general right of Parliament to disqualify. It was a right that was frequently exercised for the best purposes. That House disqualified Placemen and Pensioners from sitting on its benches. But had it a right to disqualify on the score of religion?—A man could not abandon or adopt a belief in a particular religion at will. All the Kings of the earth could not produce in the mind of any individual a conviction of the truth of a single proposition of religion; and therefore to disqualify a man for that, which lay beyond the influence of human controul, when the safety of others was not endangered by it, was in every respect unjustifiable. On what was the opposition to the admission of the Catholics to the enjoyments of their civil privileges founded? It was said to be on account of certain principles of an immoral and dangerous tendency, of which it was supposed the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion furnished evidence. These objections to the Catholics had been often stated—and what was the amount of them? That the Catholics were insensible to the moral obligation of an oath—that they disregarded the obligation of an oath—that notwithstanding any oaths they might take to support the Constitution, their first endeavour would be to subvert the Constitution, the admission to the privileges of which had so long been the object of their ambition. Suppose Sir Wm. Jermingham, or any other Catholic gentleman of this country, indicted for high treason, and that in proof of his guilty purpose of subverting the Constitution, the only evidence adduced by the Counsel for the Crown were the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion—that there was offered in evidence, the proceedings of the Councils of Constance, of Lateran and Trent,—Gandolph's Treatise, and the reception he met with at Rome,—the revival of the Jesuits, and in some parts of Europe the revival of the Inquisition. These, it was to be recollected, were the arguments offered, not against an individual Catholic, but against the Catholic body [hear!] Let it be supposed that the Counsel for the Roman Catholic Gentleman offered as evidence the oath which at the instance of Parliament the Catholics took—the answers of the six Catholic Universities, expressly disclaiming the principles of disregard to oaths imputed to Catholics—the thanks of Parliament to the Roman Catholics, as forming a considerable part of the armies of the country, on account of their courage and good conduct—the appointment at the present moment of Catholics to situations of power and trust—the Judge, on an occasion of such a nature, would at once say, it was unnecessary to trouble the Jury, as no case had been made out. And yet on evidence of this nature the whole body of Catholics were to be excluded from their Constitutional rights.

He did not mean to question at all the power of Parliament to exclude from participation in the Constitution whatever threatened its existence; but he denied that any such danger was to be apprehended to it from the admission of the Catholics. He would say, first, that the Roman Catholics had a right to participate in all the benefits of the Constitution, by the Common Law of the land. Secondly, that Parliament had no right whatever in justice to call on him to abjure his religion, where that religion was not

inconsistent with the safety of his fellow subjects. Thirdly, that the professing the Roman Catholic Religion could not be considered as evidence against any man of his entertaining opinions inconsistent with the safety of his fellow-subjects.—Fourthly, That they had disqualified him for things which he had abjured, and they called on him to abjure that which contained none of those things for which they had disqualified him.—Fifthly, They by this proceeding, did that towards a whole body of men, for doing which towards a single individual, a judge would infallibly be impeached. But he wished also to observe, that in depriving the Roman Catholic of the common right of every subject of the realm, they in a great degree shook the foundation of their own faith, and disobeyed the commands of natural and revealed religion. When we said that some of the ceremonies of the Roman Catholics were of an immoral and dangerous nature—when we said that the persons who professed the Roman Catholic religion were incapable of the moral obligation of an oath—when we said that religion was not divine; what was this but saying that the Christian religion had not yet reached those countries where the Roman Catholic religion prevailed—that the Christian religion had not yet reached France, Italy, Spain, or Portugal, and the greatest part of Germany? When we said that the greatest part of Europe had not the religion of Christ, we deprived that religion of one great proof of its superiority. We must either give up our argument, or give up our religion. But unfortunately we entered into this contest about religion with so keen a zeal, that in the course of the contest, we have forgotten the Gospel [hear, hear, hear!] It happened naturally enough here, that men, in violently contending for religion, forgot the great author of all religion. In our hatred to Papists, we had shaken in some degree the foundation of our own religion, and very much neglected and disobeyed the principal orders of both natural and revealed religion. The principal orders of religion were the love of our fellow-creatures. The advocates of natural religion maintained we could only serve God by serving one another, by mingling with each other in offices of love and charity, and considering all mankind as forming a part of our system. The Gospel said the same. The principal which our great Redeemer chiefly enforced, was love of mankind. He came on earth to establish the two great principles of love of God and love of man; and supported by miracles and the transcendent excellence of the principles themselves, the Christian religion soon established its authority over the most enlightened parts of the world. But instead of conforming to both these principles, we disputed the latter [hear, hear, hear!] We forgot the moral obligation altogether, and accordingly with respect to our fellow-creatures we showed our love for them by disqualifying our subjects, and denouncing the greater part of Europe on account of Popery, and thus disobeyed the precepts of our own Gospel [hear, hear, hear!] We first suspended the blessings of the Constitution, and then we suspended those blessings which the Gospel ordered. But it was said that we could not believe the Roman Catholics on their oaths. Then we could not believe them when we declared the Roman Catholics good and loyal subjects—then we could not believe them when we repealed the Penal Laws against them—then we could not believe them when we gave them the elective franchise—then we could not believe them when we gave them commissions in our armies—then we could not believe them when we established Popery in Canada. Papists had been restored to authority by Protestant Ministers. You carried the Pope on your back [laugh]. You have raised him up, and replaced him on his Throne as a great Power, with Ministers and armies at his command. You found him poor, and unable to command the assistance of a single Roman Catholic, forced to truckle to the will of a great Captain, who subjected him to violence and insult. You found him deposed by his Catholic subjects, and you, by your Protestant Minister, restored him. He would say to him, Did you restore him, that you might not restore the Roman Catholics of Ireland to their rights [hear, hear, hear!] But you saw that the danger did not come from that quarter; you saw that the principles of Christians of any description were safe, and those of Infidels of any description unsafe [hear, hear, hear!] You saw the effects of this infidelity in France, when, in that great Catholic Nation, attempts were made to introduce it in place of the worship of the living God. You saw that the Roman Catholic Church was not what it had been represented—that it was not a faithless Church, but a better guide of human action than useful philosophy—and that Christianity, with certain sacraments, was better than infidelity [hear, hear, hear!]. Accordingly the different Princes of Europe, Protestant and Catholic, united themselves into one Christian fraternity, in order to support their common religion. Will you tell me that you supported a Popish Sovereign in his endeavours to secure his own faith, and yet that you will punish your own subjects for professing that faith? What will you do by this? You will do the very thing which of all others is most to be deprecated. You will declare to mankind that religion is nothing more than an artifice—that it is only useful for the power which it gives to Sovereigns to repress the liberties of their subjects [hear, hear, hear!].

He was aware that when they established a political conformity, they created the necessity of a religious; otherwise they would declare that religion was an artifice, and thus totally deprive it of credit with all sensible men. But it was said the Roman Catholics wished to be admitted to the benefits of the Constitution for the sake of overturning the Government and establishing the dominion of their own religion. But this was founded on principles wholly and fundamentally false. It supposed that the Catholics were so much in love with their Church and the temporal advantages of their Clergy, that they would prefer their power to the gratification of every other wish or passion. We ought to recollect that the Gospel, which contained principles of the most sublime morality, forbid us to entertain any such fears.

from the Catholics; that Gospel was their Gospel as well as ours; and to argue that the Catholics only wished for a restoration to their rights for the sake of enabling them to rise against the Constitution, was to argue that the Catholics would rise against their King, against their God, and against the Gospel; and do that for which they would be hanged in this world and damned in the next [hear, hear!]. Suppose that Dr. Poynter, who was a most excellent man, and who would be an honour to any religion, should go to the Duke of Norfolk, and that the Duke, after restoration to his privileges, should become a traitor on the persuasion of Dr. Poynter, what would be the nature of the arguments which he might make use of on such an occasion? Dr. Poynter could only say, your Grace is now vested with political power, and I suppose you will naturally use that power for the purpose of subverting the Constitution [laugh]. It is true your Grace, if you succeed, can gain nothing, and if you fail in your attempt, as you certainly must, you will lose your head; but then, if you succeed, I shall be made Bishop of London. The act by which we disfranchised the Catholic religion, was the disfranchisement of our own religion. If they destroyed the Roman Catholic Church, they might depend on it, they would endanger their own. If even the Clergy of that religion were put down, they would let in on Europe a deluge of infidelity. Vain would then be the attempt of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge to rebuke the storm they had excited. It is true they might say, they only wished to keep down the Roman Catholic Religion, but by so doing they would lose the prop of that religion, and by the arguments against it, teach the people to suspect their own. It would then be found, that by the arguments with which they taught, that the Roman Catholic Religion was so abominable, that if not put down it would overturn the Government, they had argued so well that they conquered their own religion and their own Priests too. If you prove the religion of Europe to be false, you will prove that your own is not true; and if you prove that the conduct of the Clergy of Europe is abominable, you will prove that it is impossible for yours to be perfectly pure [hear!]. The Deist, on the principle of unbelief, will endeavour to put you down, and the Sectary on a principle of hostility. This must be the tendency of your arguments against the Catholics. He would say then that by letting loose declamations against the Clergy of Europe, they might depend on it they would shake the safety of their own establishment. He deprecated, therefore, the use of arguments offensive and insulting to the Clergy of other countries. He had heard, and heard with concern, the Petitions of the Clergy of the Church of England against the Roman Catholics. There was much which the ceremonies of the Catholic Church had in common with our own; and he was greatly disposed to concur with those who thought highly of the majesty and splendour which our religion derived from the Catholic. By these you guarded the majesty of God against the intrusion of profanity. He confessed he liked to look at the architraves of a cathedral, to hear the human voice echoed through its aisle—these things gave a soul, as it were, to piety, and swayed the senses on the side of religion [Hear, hear!]. Whatever contributed to the strengthening the influence of religion, could not be indifferent to the Christian religion came recommended to us by the testimony of the greatest and wisest men who ever lived, to its truth and excellence. The man of the most astonishing talents, perhaps, of all the men who ever lived, Sir Isaac Newton, was a Christian—the man who best understood and unfolded the operations of the human mind, the great Locke, was a Christian—the man who looked most deeply into the works of God in the creation, was a Christian. If the Church of England shewed only an anxiety to destroy other Churches, it would soon destroy itself—he would say to its Ministers, you will not conquer other religions, but you will conquer a great principle of piety [Hear, hear!]. He would rather tolerate all religions with the view of preserving a reverence to all. They might depend on it if things were left free, the good sense of our own religion must have place, and produce insensibly that conformity which would establish a unity of action [hear, hear!]. It had been said, if Catholics were allowed to enter the Legislature, they would insist on a share of the revenues of the Protestant Church—if they made Catholics Members of Parliament, they would insist on the establishment of the Catholic religion: But what was the case? At the present moment, an establishment was offered for the Catholic Clergy, and it was declined. The Protestant at present said it would be better for the Catholic to have his livelihood under the law; the Catholic was afraid of his Clergy getting their livelihood under the Minister [Hear, hear, hear!]. He wished to keep them nearer the people, to prevent the ascendancy of the Minister. The general disqualification under which the Catholics laboured was without an object after the death of the Pretender. It had been said that the Revolution finally settled the exclusion of the Catholic from offices of power and trust, and that this could not now be repealed. The settlement at the Revolution was, however, but a human arrangement, and therefore could not be final. The Revolution was a triumph over a bad principle—it was a victory of civil and religious liberty over tyranny. But when the Roman Catholics no longer partook of the principle of tyranny which then existed, they could no longer be rightfully excluded, and therefore the declaration which excluded them could not be intended as a final settlement. But it was said that this declaration had been declared to be final by both Houses of Parliament. The House of Lords, however, at the time of the Scotch Union, when they had to determine whether the declaration was or was not fundamental, decided that it was not fundamental. The Act of Union, after the Revolution, declared that it was not final. The Act of the Irish Union declared that the declaration was not final but provisional. It did more—it called it a declaration which was not merely provisional but even conditional, in order to induce the Catholics to support the Union. Parliament had therefore settled that the exclusion was not final, and was not merely provisional but conventional. There was not only not a cove-

nant for the finality of the arrangement, but there was a covenant of the Protestant with the Catholic against its finality.

By Acts of Parliament it was declared, that the rigour of the laws should be enforced, not against Catholics generally, but such as submitted to the temporal power of the Pope. It had been said, that by this declaration Parliament was made a Protestant Parliament. But the House of Lords was not exclusively Protestant. The House of Commons was not exclusively Protestant. When he said the House of Lords, he meant that the Peerage was not. Of the Commons of the realm, no small proportion were Irish Catholics. So far from the House of Commons being Protestant, Catholics could vote in that House. If he took the oaths, he might be a Member. Taking the oaths at the Bar of the House of Commons was not conformity. It was not therefore true that we had a Protestant House of Commons and a Protestant House of Peers. When Gentlemen said that the Catholics were disaffected, he denied this. It was not founded on fact. You may argue the human character down to the level of your own charges, but that will not establish the truth of the charges. In a former debate upon this question, it had been said, that according to the Constitution it was impossible to restore the Catholic to the privileges of the Constitution; but *facilis est discensus averti*; it had been found no very difficult matter, to deprive the Catholic of his liberties; yet when he prayed to be restored to them, the thing was deemed impossible. Some time ago a Committee had been appointed to inquire into the laws which affected the Catholics, and the country had then witnessed the great and strenuous exertions of Mr. Burke and Mr. Fox on the subject. Several Members now present had been on that Committee amongst whom were the Noble Lord opposite (Lord Castlereagh,) his Right Honourable Friend near him (Mr. Tierney,) and an Honourable Member above him. (Mr. Wilberforce,) whose name and fame resounded throughout Africa, as well as Europe. But since that period, circumstances had greatly changed; the feelings by which Catholics had been actuated, as well as the feelings entertained against them, had undergone great alteration; yet still objections were made to their being placed on a level with their Protestant fellow subjects. We restored the Pope and enthroned papal authority in Italy; we re-established Popery in France—he would not speak of Spain—we planted Popery in America, and we subsidized it in Austria; but after having done all this, one-fifth of the subjects of these kingdoms were deprived of the privileges of the Constitution, solely because they worshipped their God according to that form of religion, the advocates and supporters of which we had assisted in every other country. The Act of Supremacy required that persons occupying Civil Offices should abjure the influence or jurisdiction of all foreign or spiritual power which could be exercised by temporal means. The Catholic was ready to take this oath; but that was not all; there was another oath required of him: he was called upon also to abjure that form of worship in which he had been accustomed to adore his God. This form ought to be set aside. Security had been asked for by some; it had been refused by others, who said it was impossible any security could be sufficient—the Catholics went against the rules of the Gospel; no security could be considered sufficient. Then, by this doctrine, Protestants might pray to God regularly, while they damned all who differed from them. When a Roman Catholic was told, that he could not be allowed to fill a civil office, he was given to understand that he was a bad subject; but when he was told, that to fill such office he must abjure his religion, he was confirmed in the opinion of being a good Catholic, and that his being conscientiously so, was his own disability. The only argument from this was, that a man being eligible to a civil office was not to choose the form in which he was to worship his Creator until the Crown was consulted upon it. In cases where the law of the land was concerned, the law of the land was allowed to decide; but where the law of God was concerned a question instantly arose, how far it was convenient, or in accordance with the opinions and prejudices of the times, to allow the fulfilment of that divine law. This was, in fact, trying the wisdom and omnipotence of the Almighty by the worldly forms and calculations which regulated their ordinary temporal concerns. It was inquiring what sort of religion was calculated to suit the policy of the times.

It had been objected, that the Catholic was unfit to be admitted to a participation in the privileges of the Constitution; that he was not attached to it; if so, it was the fault of his country, not of the Catholic. He had been placed below the Constitution; he had been pointed out as one unworthy of enjoying the privileges which he saw open to his Protestant neighbour; and if under these circumstances he had become unfit to fill the offices filled by almost all other persuasions, then the fault rested not with him but with those who had so held him in degradation. But place the Catholic on a footing with his Protestant fellow-subjects; let him become sensible of those privileges by participating in them, and then you will find him as much attached to the Constitution, and as zealous in support of it, as any other subject of this country [hear!]. There had been various Petitions bearing the signature of the greatest responsibility laid on the table, praying a removal of the disabilities under which Catholics laboured. Among those were to be found the names of two of the most noble and ancient families in the kingdom—men whose ancestors had assisted in procuring the signing of Magna Charta. Those families were Catholic, and they prayed to the House that they may be allowed a participation in those privileges, which had been gained to the country by their ancestors [loud cheers]. If it were urged that the Catholic would support the Constitution, as he had another object, his religion, in view, the argument would go too far; with respect to Scotland, for instance, it would hold equally good, and yet no objection was made with respect to the privileges of the Constitution extending to that country. In a word, such an argument would go to prove

that there could be no perfect allegiance, as the worshipping of God could be caused as an object to which all consideration of the Constitution must be secondary. It was objected to the Catholic, that he acted on the principle *expugnare et pervenire ad internecionem*. But now the Catholics of Europe had ceased from persecution, and the Protestant, who was the first to raise his voice against, and denounce such unchristian feelings, became himself the criminal, whose conduct he reprobated [hear!]. It was now upwards of forty years since this question was first agitated; and within that period several concessions have been made, and public feeling has changed much with respect to the Catholics. In the long continued contest two things had been made manifest: first, a concession of the safety with which the privileges of the Constitution could be extended to them; and, secondly, the practicability of such extension. From the different statements which had been made to the House, it appeared that the Protestants of the United Kingdom were in the proportion of six to one to the Catholics. Therefore, if all restrictions were removed, still Parliament would be essentially Protestant, and a Protestant ascendancy be fully secured, even though the Catholics were all to return Members of their own persuasion; but the House must perceive the impossibility of doing so.

In addition to this, the House should take into their consideration the amalgamation of feeling which must of necessity take place on the removal of all political differences; when the Catholic found he was placed on a footing with his Protestant neighbour, and when he saw what was the interest of the one must be also the interest of the other. Within the last forty years the differences on this head had been greatly weakened, and it needed only the adoption of this measure to do away with them altogether. It had been urged, that if this measure were carried, the Catholic ascendancy would prevail in Ireland, but it could not do so unless it also prevailed in England, as the interests of the two countries would become so blended as to be inseparable. Another objection was, that the trade and commerce of the country had vested the greater part of the landed property of Ireland in the hands of the Catholics, and therefore, that emancipating them from the disabilities under which they at present laboured would be to give them the greater part of the political influence of the country. This was to say, in other words, that the great landed proprietors of the country ought to be made aliens to the Constitution [hear!]. He well remembered when a Noble Lord introduced a Bill in 1807, for opening the army to Catholics, what an alarm prevailed; the general cry was "turn him out; turn his Bill out;" and the consequence was, that the Bill did not pass. He also recollected that when a similar Bill was introduced about two years ago, it was read a first and second time, committed, reported, read a third time, and passed, and all this without a dissentient voice being raised against it in that House. It went through a similar process in the House of Lords, and the mitre was observed to nod assent to it; not a single objection was made against it. After the passing of this Bill the Tower of London was found to be in its usual place; the spires of Cambridge and Oxford were observed to keep their stations, unshaken and without sustaining any injury; in short, no public alarm was excited, and the Constitution was found to be as little in danger as it had been previously to the introduction of the measure [hear! and a laugh]. Nothing could shew more fully than this the needlessness and prejudice of the alarm which had previously prevailed on the question. Now political power was refused on the same ground; the Catholics were told that they might, if they pleased, obtain command of the forces of the country by sea and land, but that they could not be allowed to fill civil offices [hear!]. The ground of such a refusal shewed a disposition to take from the Deity his power of universal benevolence, and to make him an instrument of awful wrath for temporal and party purposes. This country had taken the lead in every effort to free the inhabitants of all other nations from the slavery and tyranny under which they laboured; but after having done so, she, Old England, endured the disgrace of keeping one-sixth of her subjects from the enjoyment of the privileges of the Constitution; as if she had received to herself a monopoly of the Gospel. The Honourable Member, after having forcibly extolled the late brilliant achievements on the Continent, and the necessity of crowning those achievements by removing the disabilities under which so large a portion of our fellow-subjects laboured, concluded by moving for a Committee of the whole House, to consider the state of the Laws as affecting the Oaths to be taken by Persons filling Civil Offices; and also to consider how far it was expedient to make Roman Catholics eligible to such Offices, in common with their Protestant fellow-subjects.—The Right Honourable Member sat down amidst loud cheers from both sides of the House.

MR. CROKER seconded the motion. He felt that he owed some apology to the House for thus presenting himself at so early a stage of the debate: but he trusted what he had to offer, would be deemed some excuse for his having done so. It had fallen to his lot to consider some of the penal laws as they had formerly operated, and to trace their origin from the darker ages down to the present. In doing so, he had been struck with the change which the character of those laws had undergone; they having by degrees become mild and adopted to civilized life. The Right Honourable Member, who had just sat down, stated with great effect the nature of the Bill, which had been introduced two years ago relative to the admission of Catholics to the Army and Navy. It certainly had passed without a dissentient voice, though it was similar to that Bill which but a few years before caused such alarm in the country. He (Mr. Croker) had the honour of introducing that Bill to the House, and he had done so more in compliance with the doubts of others, than from any feeling on his own part of its necessity, as his opinion then was, and still continued to be, that the Catholics were admissible, by the law of the land, previously to its introduc-

tion. Nay he would venture to say, that there did not at this moment exist any law which could prevent a Roman Catholic from being Lord Chancellor of England. He was aware that this assertion would excite surprise in many who heard him, and he owned he could hardly believe his own inspection on the subject were it not that the Act on which he founded his opinion was then on the Table, in support of his assertion. What did that Act do? It had been said that it opened the army and navy to the Catholics, but the army was equally open to them previously to its being introduced. He now said that this was the law of the land, and he thought that after the statements he had to make to the House, no Honourable Friend of his would oppose going into the proposed Committee; as if he (Mr. C.) could maintain that this was the law of the land, any Gentlemen who objected to the motion must retrace his steps, and devise some new mode of legislation.—From some offices Catholics were excluded by direct declarations of the Legislature, that Papists shall not hold such and such offices; from more they were indirectly excluded by Acts which provided that such and such objects of ambition should not be opened to persons who would not consent to take the oaths which the religion of the Catholics prevented them from taking. It was on account of this form of the law that an Honourable Member had said that we did not exclude the Catholics, but that they excluded themselves by not taking the oaths prescribed. They should now see what the law was. There were now on the Statute Book nearly 150 Acts on this subject, some repealed in small part, some repealed in the greater part, some re-enacted, some prescribing one oath, some another, of allegiance or supremacy, and even setting forth two different forms of the declaration against transubstantiation; for one statute, 25 Charles II. prescribed a short oath respecting transubstantiation which referred to nothing but the real presence in the Lord's Supper; and the next, the 30th of Charles II. prescribed another form of declaration, comprising other subjects, when the object was to exclude Catholics from Parliament.

As the laws were so complex, there would be an apology for him, if he did not make the matter so clear as he wished, to the understanding of the House. He should pass by all the mass of law which preceded the accession of the House of Hanover, when we might be said to have taken a new lease of the Constitution. The first of George I. was the act now in force, which prescribed the taking the oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration, and the declaration against transubstantiation, but in what way did it prescribe them. It stated, that every person who should receive any office of emolument or trust, or who served the Crown in any capacity, should be bound to take these oaths in one of the Courts of Westminster, or at the Sessions of the Peace; but this he was obliged to do, not before taking the office, but within three months after; such was the liberality of the law which had increased in proportion to the increasing stability of the constitution. The next step was to extend the time allowed for taking this oath from three to six months, and after that (in the 6th of Geo. I.) followed the first of the laws called Indemnity Acts, which, reciting all Acts passed against Protestant Dissenters, and what was more important to the present question, against Catholics, gave them time to take these oaths till the 25th March next ensuing, and so on in every year, taking care before the 25th March in each year to extend the term to that day in the year following. From the 6th of Geo. II. these Indemnity Acts had passed from year to year, without interruption, during nearly a century, without a single observation, and had thus virtually, legally, actually, repealed those pains and penalties with which the law threatened the Catholics. What he had to state now would be new to some Members of the House, though not to all, because he had himself mentioned it to some. In the first speech in which Mr. Fox had introduced his subject to Parliament, in which he stated the question with such luminous brevity, and adorned it with such brilliant abundance of illustration, he stated that though the subordinate offices of the army and navy were open to the Catholics, the higher offices, such as General and Admiral, were shut against them. Now it happened on the contrary at that time, that though the higher ranks of the army were, in fact, open to them, even the lower ranks of the navy were shut against them; for an Act was passed shortly after to declare, that whereas doubt had existed as to the legality of imposing oaths antecedent to the appointment of an officer, and that whereas this practice had been discontinued in the army, and that it was desirable that the two services should be put on a footing of equality, the same oaths should be discontinued in the navy also. It was supposed too, with reason, by Mr. Fox, that if there was any office which our ancestors would have been most anxious to prevent a Catholic from enjoying it, would be that of Lord High Admiral, it was the office which King James kept to himself, and which the first step of the Revolution was to lay hold on. This office of high trust and emolument was of course to be guarded with jealousy against the inroads of Catholics, and Mr. Fox had employed the happiest irony in describing two Commissioners, sitting at the Board of Admiralty together, and discussing not whether a fleet should be sent to the Mediterranean or the West Indies, but the doctrine of transubstantiation. But the truth was, that the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral, had taken no oaths since the memory of man, and in the teeth of those penalties which threatened them, they were free from all trammel [hear!]. He mentioned this fact to excuse any errors which he might fall into, by shewing that even a man of Mr. Fox's almost miraculous sagacity, had not escaped mistakes on this complex subject. But as he had been induced to look closely at these laws, at first by duty and since by inclination, at this time when Ireland and England had their eyes upon them, Ireland with eyes of expectation, and England, he hoped, not with eyes of alarm, he wished to shew the Catholics that the Protestants had not been hostile to them in reality, though threatening in appearance, and though they had been coy they had been kind [hear, hear, hear!]. He rested his case on this.—The Acts of Indemnity were not mo-

cern; they were old as the Hanover Family on the Throne; they had been continued eighty-five years without interruption, and with what interruptions he had not had time to ascertain from the 6th of G. I.

It was now worth while to examine how the laws had become thus mitigated towards the Catholics. It was by Henry VIII. that the oath of supremacy was established. That oath was established, as was well known, for none of those objects which were now in view [hear!]; but to establish a dogma of that Monarch's, that he was the head of the Church—an opinion which had now become a part of the Protestant religion of the kingdom—an opinion which every body believed, and which was now gone into disuse. This Act, which was passed by that beneficent Monarch, was re-enacted by Queen Elizabeth, and she had this excuse, that the Protestant religion was not then firmly established. But neither in her time nor in the time of James and Charles, during the infancy, nor during the fiery trial of the Church of England, was there ever a thought of excluding Catholics from Parliament. This was reserved for what Blackstone called a period of madness, the time of the Popish Plot, when, by the 25th of Charles II. the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and the declaration against the real presence, were imposed; and by the 30th of Charles II. was imposed a more voluminous declaration, not only against the real presence, but against idolatrous worship, reverence to the Virgin Mary. What was extraordinary was, that in subsequent Acts, sometimes the one and sometimes the other of these oaths were imposed, apparently according to no other rule than the whim of the Legislature; and in an Act of William, Officers of the Navy were subjected, in one part of the Act, to a penalty, if they did not take the oath of the 30th, they being at the same time only required to take the 25th of Charles II. These tests, which were repealed in the reign of James II. were re-enacted by the Convention Parliament; and at that time, with a Pretender to the Throne, not in France, but on the shores of Ireland, they obliged every man, previously to the assumption of an office, to take the oaths. But this Act, he contended, was not now in existence, for not only did every Indemnity Act never refer to it, but the words of the oath negated the idea, as it was enacted that the oath should be taken in the words following, "and no other," and these words were, "you shall true allegiance bear to King William and Queen Mary," not as in the subsequent Acts, *mutatis mutandis*, or with a blank to be filled up by the name of the person entitled to the Crown under the Act of Settlement. It was, perhaps, indiscreet in him to mention this Act, for if it was, as some Gentlemen would maintain, still in force, he was himself subject to very heavy penalties; for he had not, in point of fact, sworn to bear allegiance to King William and Queen Mary. If, on the other hand, this Act was not in force, the only Act was that of George I. which he contended was the new lease of the Constitution, and with it the *perennial* Indemnity Act [a laugh], for it was falsely called an annual though it flowered every year, completely exempted all persons from the necessity of taking the oaths; for, in the first place, there was the Act which allowed every Officer six months to consider before he took the office, and then the Indemnity Act granted six months more. These Acts of Kings William and George were passed at the same time in Ireland as well as in England. But in 1793, a special Act of indulgence to the Irish Catholics was passed, enabling them to hold offices on taking an oath of allegiance prescribed to them, except a dozen or two offices named in the Act. Among these offices were those of Lord Lieutenant, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant and Commander in Chief. No Papist was to hold any of these offices, so said the Act: but in fact they might; there was no chemical test to know them [a laugh]; the first thing to be done, was "catch your Papist."

Suppose there was any authority constituted to administer the oath to the Chief Secretary (which there was not), he might say I am allowed six months to deliberate whether I will take the oath; if I do not, then take it, the Act of Indemnity last passed, protects me till March 25, 1820. But it might be said the Secretary was obliged to take the Privy Councillor's oath [hear, from Mr. Peel]. But a Secretary was not obliged to be a Privy Councillor; he was now reasoning on the strictness of the law; it might be said just as well, that it was unlikely that any one would be Secretary who was not in Parliament. But he would go a step further, and say, that there was nothing to prevent a Catholic from being a Privy Councillor, and this perhaps would be thought going far enough [a laugh]. There was nothing in any of the Acts of Parliament which specifically pointed out the office of Privy Councillor; it might be a place of trust within the meaning of the law. But there was no place fixed for taking the oaths. The Members of Parliament were to take the oaths at the Table of their House when the Speaker was in the Chair, but the general regulation as to all other persons was, that they should take the oaths in one of the four Courts of Westminster, or at the Sessions of the Peace. If the law, therefore, was imperative on Privy Councillors, to take the oath at the Council Board was not enough to satisfy it. In the old statutes, persons were named before whom the oaths of different persons were to take the oaths; the Clergy before the Archbishop, the two Houses before the Lord Steward, the Army before the Master General. The manner in which the Privy Council now took its oaths was a relief of the old custom. The same was the case with the oaths of the Judges. The Privy Councillor has a common law oath of office, the Judges have an oath founded either in the common law, or in statutes of the earliest times; the Judges having had this oath to take, and being required by law to take other oaths of supremacy, allegiance, abjuration, and this declaration against transubstantiation within a certain time, had been in the habit of having all the oaths entered on a roll, and taken at once to avoid trouble. When these oaths were tendered to him, a Catholic Judge might say—"I will take the oath of office, but as to the declaration, Parliament gives me six months to consider of it, and then protects me during a further term, which is always extended from year to year by a Bill of in-

demnity, and I will not take the oaths till Parliament shall turn back the course of experience and the wisdom of an age" [hear, hear, hear!]. He trusted some Protestant Judge might be found who though he might conscientiously take the oaths, would yet have public spirit enough to try the point. The oath of supremacy contained a declaration that no foreign prince or prelate *hath* or ought to have any power temporal or spiritual within this realm. This was also very well at a time when Popery was banished out of England; it was very well at a time when this test might be put to any man; and when he who refused to take it was banished; he should not object to take the oath at that time. But now, when his Right Honourable Friend moved the grant to the College of Maynooth [hear!]-when Acts had passed declaring that nothing in the Acts "should affect the doctrine or discipline of the Catholic Church," how could it be asserted on oath, as a matter of fact, that no foreign prelate "*hath*" any spiritual power within this realm, whatever we might think of the "ought to have" [hear, hear, hear!]-By the 33d of the King (Sir J. Mitford's Act), and by a similar Act passed at the same time in Ireland, an oath of allegiance was contrived for the use of the Catholic, in which he had to swear that no foreign Potentate or Prelate *hath* or ought to have any power (but here followed the material difference)—any power, "political or temporal," within this realm. The oath of supremacy thus caught the Protestant and freed the conscience of the Catholic; the Catholic swore to a simple fact, while the Protestant swore to an assertion, the truth of which was only reconcilable by a sophistical interpretation of the words [hear, hear, hear!]. To mention another instance of the absurdity and inconsistency of this penal legislation:—it would be supposed that if any persons would be guarded carefully against the influence of Popery, they would be the sworn servants of the King, such as the Lord Steward and Lord Chamberlain, who, from their situations, might be supposed to have the means of influencing the opinions of the Monarch; yet, while the poor naval officer was obliged to take the long declaration of the 30th of Charles II.; the Lord Steward only took the short one of the 25th; such was the confusion prevailing respecting them, that in all the Acts of Indemnity, the two Declarations were termed "the said Declaration," though they were as different, not as light from darkness, but as a light day from a very dark one [hear! and a laugh]. The troubles of the Church originated in the Act of Supremacy; and jealously kindled by the French marriage of Charles I. increased by the conduct of the Stuarts, burst forth at the time of the strange Popish plot, which has puzzled the age that followed no less than the contemporaries.

"that plot the nation's curse,

- "Bad in itself, but represented worse;
- "Rais'd in extremes, and in extremes decried,
- "With oaths affirm'd, with dying vows denied,
- "Not weigh'd nor winnow'd by the multitude,
- "But swallow'd in the mass, unchew'd and crude.
- "Some truth there was, but dash'd and brew'd with lies,
- "To please the fools, and puzzle all the wise.

It was not surprising, in the following reign, when the people had seen the King going to Mass, and at the same time perceived his design to overturn their liberties, that their fears should break out into that long Declaration against Popery, or that strong and decisive measures should be taken. It was necessary, at the time of the Revolution, to give strength and certainty to the young and struggling Government; there was no time to send to the Quarter Sessions Admiral Russel or Montague to take the Whig oaths before Tory Gentlemen. The battle of La Hogue might have been lost, and King James might have been in Hampshire; the time would bear no delay. But on the accession of George I. who made it his boast that he succeeded like an eldest son to his father, it was not advisable that public business should be suspended and three months were given to take the oaths. The Rebellion in 1715 sprung up and was defeated, and the Pretender continued to exist more as the bug-bear of a party than as a real danger to the Hanover family. Six months were then given, and George II. by the first Act of his reign shewed his desire to promote still further toleration and unanimity. Hence it appeared that the Princes of the House of Hanover felt very wisely as became them, that the best security for their establishment, was in the practice of liberality, and in the conciliation of the regard and attachment of the people. In prosecution of this policy, the acts to which he had alluded, were passed, and the people were consequently quieted. The flutter in a number of bosoms being allayed, as Dr. Johnson expressed it, the mind of the country indeed operated in aid of the wisdom of the Legislature to dispel religious animosity, and to promote public harmony. Hence the principles of the statute of Charles II. were acted upon, under all his successors, up to the present day. He had adduced several Acts illustrative of these principles, in order to shew the *rationale* upon which the Legislature proceeded, and which had been uniformly acted upon in the several Statutes of Indemnity, these Statutes comprehending, as he contended, the Catholics, as well as the other classes of Dissenters. This opinion he was fully prepared to maintain, although he had never heard it before urged in that House.

Now as to the right of Catholics to sit in that House, he conceived that that right stood on the same basis as that to which he had already adverted. The act of the 30th Charles, notwithstanding its declaration, *ex majori cantela*, did not negative this right; for that right was still to be inferred from the several Acts of Indemnity. In order to shew this, indeed, he thought it unnecessary to refer to any other Act of Indemnity that passed within the last year. It so happened, however, that the Act of Charles II. was repealed by the Act of William III. in which new oaths were prescribed. But still the former was so connected with the latter—the dead body and the living were so tied together, that the living was only to be explained by

reference to the dead; and upon this explanation it would appear, through the Indemnity Act, a Catholic could sit in that House until the 25th of March in every year, when the Act expired, unless the Speaker would attempt to interrupt the current wisdom of ages by calling for his exclusion, or refusing him the benefit of the indemnity. He had already observed, that in the Act passed upon the proposition last Session, Catholics were rendered admissible to civil and military offices. But even that Act he considered as a mere declaratory law to guard against misconception, for according to his view of the spirit and letter of the Annual Indemnity Act, he regarded them as so admissible before that Act was passed. If, indeed, such were not the meaning of the Indemnity Act, he must conceive the Commander in Chief of the Army and the First Lord of the Treasury guilty of a *prevarication*, as neither took the Oaths to which that Act referred. Nay the Lords of the Privy Council took the Oaths of Supremacy, Allegiance and Abjuration, as he understood, from an old book, in which the words "his Majesty" were substituted for those of "her Majesty," the substitution being merely the effect of a cancel in the book alluded to. Without the Indemnity, therefore, many others would be liable to suffer as well as the Catholics. But the Catholics were by this Act completely protected from any penalty in asserting the rights to which he had alluded. Still he did not mean to say that the Catholics should be satisfied in this way, or that it was sufficient that they enjoyed their civil rights through mere sufferance. But he addressed the arguments which he had advanced to those Gentlemen who were forward to appeal to the wisdom of our ancestors, or to the character of former legislatures, with a view to produce the impression that it had always been provided heretofore that Catholics should not be allowed to participate of the privileges of the Constitution. When Gentlemen indeed talked in this strain, he would call upon them to point out the particular period in our history to which they made their reference, and on which they would now call upon Parliament to make its stand upon this great question. If, this reference were distinctly made to answer these gentlemen, by shewing that at no time was it deemed necessary rigidly to enforce the Penal Laws alluded to with any view to the security of the established church.

That he himself was a faithful and firm friend to this establishment he felt it unnecessary to declare; for he had always felt that the glory and stability of the empire depended mainly upon the glory and stability of our Church Establishment. He was indeed an advocate for the measure contemplated by the Right Honourable Mover, because the adoption of that measure would, in his judgment, contribute most materially to strengthen our Church Establishment and Constitution. Therefore he felt that on this occasion he was supporting not merely the cause of the Catholics, but that of the Church of England. It was then from a most affectionate reverence for the Church of England that he took the course which he was at present pursuing, because he thought that course necessary with a view to guard the Constitution in the Church, as well as the State, against the approach of the common enemy, by uniting the great mass of the people in defence of both. This had indeed been always his impression upon this important question, although he had been silent upon it in that House for nearly ten years. But while silent there he had not failed to be active elsewhere, and in a manner which he hoped had not proved altogether ineffective. Now, however, he felt that he should have been guilty of treachery to his conviction and conscience, if he declined to state to the House the grounds upon which he differed in opinion from many individuals whose character he highly respected, whose friendship he cordially esteemed. He could not without pain express or entertain any difference from several of those Gentlemen, and particularly from his Right Honourable Friend behind him (Mr. Peel, as we understood), to whose private worth and eminent talents he was always ready to bear unqualified testimony. But while he regretted that difference he had the satisfaction of thinking, that in the view which he took of this question, he was sustained by the authority of Mr. Justice Blackstone, whose attachment to the Church of England could not possibly be questioned. Here the Honourable Gentleman read Mr. Justice Blackstone's observations upon the character of the penal laws against the Catholics, dwelling emphatically upon that learned Magistrate's description of the causes which led to their enactment, and upon the circumstances under which they might with perfect safety, and ought in common equity, to be repealed. These circumstances had, in his (Mr. C.'s) view, now arisen. The time for that complete repeal, which this able commentator deemed so desirable for the cause of justice, and for the honour as well as for the interest of the nation, had at length arrived; for neither the Church nor Constitution of England had now any danger to apprehend from the Pope or Pretender. The latter was no more, and as to the former, some Catholics were heard to complain that the Government of this country had too much influence upon his Holiness. Under such circumstances then whence could any apprehensions arise to prevent Parliament from doing justice to the Catholic body? Surely not from the appearance of an Archbishop of Jerusalem, or any other bugbear [hear, hear!]. In calling upon the House to do justice to the Catholics, he felt that he was only requiring it to ratify the spirit and object of the statutes to which he had referred, and this it was peculiarly incumbent upon it to do at present, from the quiet, orderly, and loyal conduct of the Catholic body for a series of years. That conduct was, indeed, most exemplary, and if there was any exception to such conduct, he would repeat to those who dwelt upon that exception, what the Right Honourable Mover had so manfully said, that when Catholics were "disloyal, it was only because the penal laws had made them so." If, however, the Catholics should forget their duty to the State, Parliament had judgment and powers enough to provide against such an aberration. But the fact was, that there was no reason whatever to ap-

prehend this aberration, especially if Parliament attended to the claims of justice upon this occasion. For the conduct of the Catholics having been good notwithstanding the oppressive operation of the penal laws, it was contrary to the nature of man to suppose that they would become bad under the influence of conciliating measures (hear, hear, hear!).

Mr. LESLIE FOSTER observed, that although the line of argument pursued by his Honourable Friend who had just sat down, might not have convinced the understanding, it could not fail to excite the astonishment of the House. For according to that argument, it would seem that all the applications which had been made to Parliament on the part of the Catholics within the last twenty-five years were quite superfluous, the Catholics being entitled to the enjoyment of every constitutional privilege, not even the right of sitting in that House excepted. But notwithstanding the copious display of legislative history and peculiar ingenuity which the House had witnessed, he ventured to differ in opinion from his Honourable Friend. He would not attempt to follow his Hon. Friend through the variety of statutes which he had quoted, but he would undertake to say, that it was a mistake to assume that the Annual Indemnity Act had any applications to the Catholics. The contrary was indeed, in his judgment, quite obvious from the terms of the preamble to that Act. For in that preamble it was stated, that indemnity should extend only to those who from ignorance, absence, or unavoidable accident were prevented from the Oaths referred to, in that Act. Now as it was morally impossible that the Catholics could at no time subscribe to those Oaths without an absolute abandonment of his creed, it was evident that his case could never be in the contemplation of the Legislature which framed this Act. A Catholic could not indeed expect from the Indemnity Act to be saved from the most severe penalties, if he ventured to undertake any office for which the oaths alluded to, formed a necessary qualification. His Honourable Friend might argue, that a person dispensing with these oaths could not have execution against him for penalties in this country within less than six months, and that therefore a renewal of the Indemnity Act would probably save him. But no such protection could be looked for in Ireland, where, according to law, the penalty might be enforced at the next Term after an action was brought, that is generally within a month. But with respect to a Catholic's sitting in that House, it was indisputable that the declarations prescribed by the 30th of Charles II. might be required from any Member of that House. Nay, it was known that the oaths alluded to, by his Honourable Friend must be taken as a condition precedent to any Member's taking his seat in that House, he contended that his Honourable Friend's argument was radically erroneous; and therefore he felt it unnecessary to follow his Honourable Friend through his quotation of 150 years of contradictory Statutes. But as to the character and consequences to be apprehended from the concessions, which it was the object of this motion to obtain, it was clear that at no time since 1807 was the Protestant feeling of this country so generally and forcibly adverse to those concessions. The Protestants of England were, indeed, decidedly adverse to this discussion, and that such an irritation as prevailed it was much easier to raise than to allay. Then as to the Protestants of Ireland, without meaning any degree of disrespect to those who had petitioned in favour of the Catholic Claims, he was prepared to affirm that a most decisive majority of the Irish Protestants were adverse to these claims. He was fully aware of the importance in rank and character of the Protestants who had petitioned from Dublin. But those who signed that Petition, were, it was known, from different parts of Ireland, comprehending altogether about 400 individuals, while the counter Petition from the Protestants, who were actually inhabitants of Dublin, was subscribed by no less than 4000 names. In judging, however, of the Protestant feeling in Ireland, Gentlemen should rather look to the North, which was originally colonized by James I. and which contained the most industrious and civilized part of the population of that country. But in saying this, he protested against being understood to speak in disparagement of the other parts of Ireland, where the state of the people was in a great measure attributable to the barbarizing consequence of the penal code (a pretty general cry of hear, hear! especially on the Opposition Benches.)

The Honourable Member assured the House that he was quite as sensible of the barbarizing consequence of the penal code, and lamented as much the necessity that called for that code, as any Gentleman who heard him. He referred to the North, rather than to the South or West, because in the former, the genuine opinion of the Irish Protestants was only to be known, and what was the evidence before the House as to the character of that opinion? The Petition from the County of Monaghan against the Catholic Claims was signed by 20,000 Protestants, that from Antrim by 19,000, that from Armagh by 15,000, and that from Fermanagh by 9,000. The Petitions from Protestants in other parts of Ireland, where the Catholic population predominated could not for obvious reasons be regarded as the criterion of the Protestant mind of that country. He was aware that there was a Petition in favour of the Catholics from Belfast, but how few were its subscribers compared to those annexed to the several Petitions which he had quoted from that quarter of the kingdom. The Protestants, indeed, of both England and Ireland, were evidently and decidedly adverse to any farther concession to the Catholics. But there was another and a strong ground of objection to the proposed concession, and that was the feeling of the Catholics themselves. It was observable, that among all the Petitions presented to the House from the Irish Catholics, there was a studious silence with regard to any of those restrictions which the advocates of the Catholic cause in that House deemed on a former occasion so necessary for the safety of the Protestant Establishment. There were three parties on this subject.—The first demanded the repeal of the penal laws, without any restriction or qualification;

the second opposed that repeal upon any condition; and the third thought that the repeal might be conceded with the enactment of certain provisions or safeguards for the protection of the Church Establishment. Upon the views of the last party a Bill was brought forward but a few years ago, and it must be recollected how this Bill was received by the Catholics of Ireland. That Bill, indeed, was of such a character, that while it was not satisfactory to any Protestant in England or Ireland with whom he had ever conversed upon the subject, excited the loudest complaints among the Catholics of Ireland. The laity of that country generally and decisively declared against it; and at one meeting at Kilkenny it was denounced as a measure which, if adopted, would serve to shake the Irish Catholic Church to its very foundation. There was no evidence that the Irish Catholics had since changed their mind upon the subject of those restrictions or safeguards, for the Protestant Establishment, without the adoption of which, the great body of the advocates for the Catholic cause in that House, had declared their attention not to acquiesce in the repeal of the penal code. Then as to the opinion of the Irish Catholic Clergy, it was known that at a synod of those ecclesiastics, it was declared that they could not accede to the establishment of a Veto, without incurring the guilt of schism; nay, that they would lay down their lives sooner than consent to such a measure. In what a state then would the country and the constitution have been placed if the measure then proposed, had been enacted, the English and Irish Protestants, as well as the Catholic Laity, being completely discontented with it, while the Catholic Clergy through whom the safety of the Protestant Establishment was to be provided for upon such an enactment, declaring their resolution to submit to martyrdom rather than conform to its provisions; yet he presumed that the adoption of some such measure was the object of these Gentlemen, with whom the motion before the House originated, if not, let the Right Hon. Mover state at once the measure which he had in contemplation, and the House might discuss and decide upon it. This appeared to him the more regular course of proceeding, and far preferable to that of resolving into a Committee for any vague or undefined object. He did not indeed agree to go into a Committee, without a distinct understanding of what was meant to be brought forward, for such a course was in his mind calculated alike to elude the Protestant and the Catholic, and therefore he felt it his duty to enter his decided protest against the motion.

No body of men were ever more completely under the controul of the Priesthood than the Catholics of Ireland. If ever the population of that country was estranged from the government, it was owing to the conduct pursued by government in former times, when it had unhappily waged war against the priesthood. This opinion suggested to him that the only practical security they could have upon acceding to the Catholic Claims, must be found in some plan by which the co-operation and good will of the hitherto alienated priesthood might be secured. But this was not to be done by a Veto, which could only tend to irritate; it was not a Veto, but a Volo; emphatically a Volo that could succeed. He did not wish to create a slavish dependence of the Catholic Clergy upon the Crown, but that sort of dependence or rather attachment which consisted in the good will that arose naturally in the breast of the person who received a benefit towards the quarter from which the benefit proceeded. He would not give to the Crown the power of placing persons of anti-Catholic principles in the higher situations of their Church, but by giving to the Crown the right of appointing Bishops from the body of their own Clergy, a greater security would be afforded to the establishment than could be found in all the oaths of abjuration and Votos that ever were devised. But the idea of effecting such an arrangement at the present moment was one of the most hopeless chimeras that ever occurred to the mind of man. There was no term of abomination thrown out against the Veto that would not now be directed against such a plan. He well knew the store of abuse he was laying up for himself in Ireland, by venturing to suggest it. Such a proposal would be described as the vilest project ever contemplated for the destruction of the Church. Its advocates would profess themselves more willing to see their religion abolished than subjected to its operation. The time for accomplishing such a plan was he feared past for ever. It was open to the Irish Parliament to have made the attempt about twenty-six years ago, but now they might as well fling a lighted torch into gunpowder, and seek in the contact a principle of preservation and tranquillity. It was now forty years since the penal code was in force in Ireland. It had been practically obsolete before, but still continued to stain the statute books. The whole, however, was then repealed, and Catholics were placed on the same footing as Protestants in every thing that regarded the right of property. Matters remained upon that footing till 1792, when they were first admitted to political power. There being then in Ireland a Roman Catholic Convention, they thought it necessary to declare, that all they sought to attain was comprised in four points. First, the right to practice in the Law; secondly, the power to act as Grand Jurors; thirdly, the power to act as Magistrates, and fourthly, the right to vote for Members for Parliament, in counties only where the qualification was more circumscribed. But Parliament, in that very year, went far beyond the ultimatum of their own desire. Parliament conferred the elective franchise of their forty shilling freeholders, a measure which, if it did not go the whole length of universal suffrage, approximated closely to that principle, while civil zeal was associated with religious enthusiasm, the most dangerous of all spirits at a popular election. The privilege thus conferred prepared the way to new claims. There was not a county which did not send petitions demanding their admission into Parliament, and in such language as induced Lord Fitzwilliam, the then Lord Lieutenant to say, that if it was not granted, the country would go into rebellion. It was no reflection against the Roman Catholics of Ireland that they had increased in their demands at every step;

the disposition was inherent in human nature itself, and under the same circumstances the Protestants would have acted in the same way. The question, in fact, came to this: if the present motion gave them all that they could get, they would be satisfied; if it did not, they would still look forward to other demands. They now sought for eligibility, they would next require possession. It might be said that one sixth of the possession was much as they could fairly expect, in reference to their comparative number, but as an Irishman, he might be permitted to consider it with regard to Ireland alone. If therefore the time was ever to come, when being three fourths of the population, the Catholics should obtain three fourths of the power, should supply from their own body three fourths of the Grand Jurors, the Magistrates, the Judges, &c. in short, three fourths of every thing that was influential in Ireland, was it not to be apprehended that they would soon aspire to take the whole into their hands. What would in that case become of the ecclesiastical part of Ireland. He did think that the granting of the present motion would be productive of danger to the Ecclesiastical Establishment; it would also hold out a bonus for the separation of the British Islands. The rivalry of religion was as dangerous as the rivalry of nations. He rested his principal objection upon the danger to the Ecclesiastical Establishment. The union of Church and State was the result of that experience which followed the fatal consequences of their separation. After tracing the history of the Church through the most important periods of our history, and maintaining that the Establishment had grown with our civil freedom and suffered oppression when that freedom was oppressed—that Church and State were two things made for each other—that their union was effected not in the spirit of theology, but on a principle of civil safety—he concluded with a caution against the introduction of a different state of things in Ireland, especially as the present had long constituted their tenure of the island.

Mr. CROKER explained.

Lord NORMANBY observed, that if the House agreed to go into a Committee on the subject, a great point would be gained by the Catholics, for he was certain that the more narrowly their cause was investigated, the more would the House be satisfied of its justice. He was glad that he had not spoken before the Hon. Gentlemen who had just sat down; aware that he was hostile to the measure, he had waited to hear his opinions, and if he had any doubts before upon the propriety of granting it, the speech of the Honourable Gentleman was sufficient to remove them (*hear, hear!*) The Honourable Gentleman relied a great deal upon the Petitions before the House, but if ever there was a question upon which Petitions should have less influence than another, it was the very question they were now occupied in considering. He felt conscientiously that in advocating the cause of the Catholics, he was maintaining those principles of justice and toleration, which constituted at the same time the brightest ornaments, and the best bulwarks of the Constitution, they were falsely supposed to endanger (*hear, hear!*) The advocates of that cause were the friends of the Constitution; in labouring for its success they sought to restore the only broken link in the bond of social order, and to establish that which was dear to each, because it was valuable to all. The Catholic was excluded by civil disqualification from every object of patriotic ambition. This, unless justified by a paramount necessity, was at least questionable in its policy. It was more, it was a violation of those very principles of civil and religious liberty, of which we boasted so much, while we retained this badge of persecution. He called it by that name, for he could not separate in his mind the idea of religious persecution from the existence of disqualifications not justified by political reason (*hear, hear!*) The influence of the system adopted towards the Catholics of Ireland, had produced the most fatal effects throughout the kingdom. As that system was relaxed, the country revived, and not until it was altogether abolished would the relief and prosperity of that country be complete. The doctrines formerly imputed to the Catholics, could not now be repeated with any success; they were denied and refuted by the Catholics themselves, and disbelieved even by those who were averse to the question. Their religious opinions could not interfere with the faithful discharge of their civil duties. As to any apprehension from the Pope's authority, the day was gone by when that could have any influence. It was true we had restored the Pope to his dominions, but in so doing, we had not rendered him more formidable to us than any of the Powers by whom he was surrounded; we did not, and could not restore to him the influence which had rendered him once so formidable. The attachment of the Catholics to arbitrary power, which was another of the ancient arguments against their relief, was also unavailing in the present age. It was contradicted not merely by their own statements and conduct, but by the support derived to their cause from the exertions of the most distinguished friends of freedom—(*hear, hear, hear!*) He might fairly allude to their loyalty as an argument in their behalf—a loyalty not nursed in the smiles of Courts and in the beams of favour; but existing in the winter of adversity, and prevailing against the storm of rebellion. He alluded to their conduct in the times of Cromwell and of Charles the Second; the latter of whom owed his life to their attachment. The cause of the Pretender, whom the Catholics were accused of favouring, was kept alive by the gallantry, and not by the religious prejudices of the times. He was willing to put the whole question at issue upon the conduct of the Catholics themselves, though he would be slow to allow that the conduct of any set of men belonging to that body should be regarded as a ground for continuing the disabilities which extended to all. Whatever therefore, might be said with regard to past events, he had no hesitation in saying that their late conduct was deserving of the most favourable consideration (*hear, hear!*). There were some persons who thought that the measure would lead to an immediate admission of the Catholics into offices. If so it was a strong argument in its favour, for the tide of popular opinion must be strong indeed upon their side, if such a consequence could be reasonably expected. For his own part, he entertained no such expectation; he believed it would be an invaluable act of grace to them, without effecting the influence of any set of men in the community (*hear, hear!*).

There was one argument sometimes resorted to, which he stigmatised as most cruel and unjust; it was that which resisted their claims as being trivial and unimportant. There were some who described it to be no peculiar hardship that the Catholics possessed rank without power, and wealth without interest; that the descendants of those who had fought the battles of the country and defended

the Constitution in former times were excluded from the benefits secured by their valour and their wisdom. It was asked, why were they not content? How could they be content? Was the father to be content, when damping the youthful ardour of his son, he was under the necessity of apprising him that his station was in obscurity; when he was obliged to tell him the bitter tale of his country's distrust; to inform him that he must be an inactive spectator of its transactions, and that what that country would accept from his menial servant with gratitude, it would certainly refuse from himself [hear, hear!]? He could proceed to shew, that the present state of things was absurd, as well as unjust: that either we had done too little or too much [hear, hear!]. He could shew, from the analogies of foreign states, that while we boasted of our liberality, religious intolerance had found its last position in our own country, and its last defenders among our own countrymen. If there was any man in the House who could think that the repeal of those statutes would be attended with serious danger to the state, let that man vote against the question [hear, hear!]. It was on that principal alone that the Legislature could have proceeded to pass the laws, for liberty of conscience was the unquestionable birthright of Englishmen, and had been coeval with the prosperity of the country. He had said nothing about securities, for where he could see no danger he could ask for no protection; but if it was felt by others, that some arrangement for this purpose should be made, he would not stand in the way of any measure of conciliation which might secure their assistance. There was one term sometimes used, to which he could not avoid objecting—it was the term equivalent. What equivalent could the Catholics give for the recovery of their privileges? But if, reducing an Act of Grace to a bare debtor and creditor transaction, they still insisted on having an equivalent, they would find an ample one in the union of all classes of their fellow subjects, and their joint co-operation in any difficult emergency [hear, hear!]. If it was not that he felt a strong impression of the justice of the cause, he would not have obtruded himself upon the attention of the House, nor could his feelings on the subject be satisfied until that period, which the liberality of the age induced him to hope was not far distant, when the Claims of the Catholics should receive the united assent of every branch of the Legislature [hear, hear, hear!].

Mr. BROWNLOW confessed that he was one of those who apprehended danger from the repeal of the Statutes. He had heard nothing yet to convince him that the Catholic religion was so modified as to justify the House in making the experiment. The Catholics asked for every thing in the shape of political privilege, but refused to give the securities which prudence must require, they would not grant what the Catholics of other countries had conceded. The Catholic Church of Ireland was unweeded of its prejudices, and incapable of withstanding the authority of the See of Rome. It was the known influence of the Pope that originally excluded them from the House, and the same reason still existed. They might impeach the wisdom of their ancestors, if they pleased, for passing those laws, but they could not justify a departure from them, upon the plea that circumstances were altered. He was perplexed at the speech of the Honorable Gentleman on the floor (Mr. Croker), but his answer to it was this, that in the opinion of all the Statesmen who had ever spoken upon this subject, the Constitution of England was considered and represented as being Protestant in all its parts.

Mr. W. BECHER expressed his hopes for the indulgence of the House. Conscious of his inability, he still felt the value of a well-meaning and independent man, delivering his sentiments on a question, which differed from other subjects of national concern in one point, that the more it was discussed, the more every rational man must feel that Catholic disabilities ought to be at length repealed. It was with him no ordinary topic, as he believed in his heart and soul, that on the liberal and enlightened disposal of the question, depended the prosperity and concord of the kingdom. As an Irishman, he viewed the question as it affected that country, immediately; but that was a limited view—for where was that man who would say, that if Ireland was disturbed, England would not be discontented [hear, hear!]. Whatever might be the differences of public men on other subjects, all must admit the necessity of some salutary change and amelioration in the condition of that country. No man felt more sincerely the strength of those valuable qualities which distinguished its inhabitants, at the same time that he was sensibly alive to that want of respect for the laws, and the reverse of which so happily characterized the people of this more fortunate part of the empire. How was it that such an appalling distinction existed? It was not, he might say with security, to undervalue his own countrymen, that he had alluded to that difference. The cause was too notorious. It sprang from a long continued system of misrule; and it was that night his strenuous object to rescue the British Constitution from the reproach. Was it not reproach? Seven hundred years had England the government of Ireland, and yet the affections of her people were never cordially obtained [cheers]. To attribute such a result to any tendency of national character was a false assumption; were there no apparent reasons for such an effect, it would argue to a great extent, an evil in the capacity of Government; but, as long as there existed the ground of exclusive privileges for one class of its community, to the subjection of the rest, it would be most uncharitable to form a judgment on conjectural assumptions. Let any Member of that House make the case his own; let him, and he can best ascertain the feelings of others by the self-examination, endeavour to ascertain what his own feelings would be, if all the avenues of honorable ambition were closed against him; will he say there would not be a proportionate abatement in his attachment to that Constitution which discountenanced him [hear!]. He could only answer for his own feelings. On them he felt such would be the impression, and with that conviction he must allow for a similar operation on the minds of others. It was asked, could the great body of the Irish people be susceptible of such impressions. He must be allowed to give an answer to that question, and what might be supposed an Irish mode, by asking another question. Were the English people insensible to such excitements? What more powerfully operated in producing the free spirit of the English nation than a consciousness of a full participation in the privileges of the Constitution? What reason had those, who asked such a question, to suppose that the Irish Catholics were so dull and insensible, notwithstanding the questions of perception that they manifested on other points, as to remain indifferent to privileges which gave a character to that people, with whom they were so intimately connected? Of the peaceable and loyal demeanour of the Catholic body they had abundant proofs. But it was not as a boon to the Catholics that he called for the repeal of these disabilities. No! Admitting that loyalty was alive to its claim of respect, he supported the motion of that night in order to get

rid of the appalling mischiefs that system of exclusion produced [hear, hear, hear!]. He was aware how much it was in the power of able and disinterested men, who advocated that cause, to excite the apprehensions of others against it. He also felt how readily many persons converted a publication and a manifesto, proceeding from an individual, against the great body to which he belonged. But when such a question was brought before Parliament, he would legislate up in the great and admitted principle, wholly unconnected with the wishes or the expectations of the Catholics, that men would be well conducted when they were well treated. That they would be attached to that Constitution which held out to them the natural motives of attachment [hear, hear, hear!]. He avoided all discussions on the nature of the religion which a great proportion of the Irish people professed. To him it was sufficient that such a numerous body existed, and that their religion was extending with the growth of the population. How was it to be neutralized, or to be made harmless? By no other than the natural means of kindness and indulgence. The more secure method of guarding against danger to the establishments, was by taking from those who were supposed not well affected, motives for hostility.

Strength and power the Catholics now possessed of, in wealth and intelligence they were progressive, then why not take the merit of bestowing that which in the nature of things they must ultimately acquire [hear!]? Severe as were the effects of such a system of restrictions on the Catholics, they operated most injuriously on the Protestant inhabitants of that country [hear, hear!]. Some of these in the pride of superiority, in the spirit of piety, and in other advantages, might feel a compensation for such injuries; but it was for the House to consider whether it were not more wise to repress than to encourage such a spirit. For he must be allowed to ask in what did the superiority of a Constitution exist which was deemed inconsistent with the happiness and security of every class of subjects? Where was the solidity of a Church Establishment which could not think itself secure but in the depression of four millions of people [hear, hear!]? While he asked those questions, he would yield to no man in admiration and reverence for both; but he put the argument in that way to shew the extremes to which the opponents of concession were compelled to resort. He knew the value of our establishments, but his sense of that value arose from his conviction that they were strong and beneficial in proportion as they were consistent with the civil and religious liberties of the people [hear, hear!]. When therefore he heard men talk of the danger of admitting their Catholic countrymen to a participation of civil rights, his question to those was, could things remain as they were? But where, he would ask, was the measure of improvement that had not to contend with similar objections?—It was by similar arguments, and in a similar spirit that the Abolition of the Slave Trade was opposed; and, without assuming any great gift of prophecy, he might safely say, that the time was fast approaching when men would look with the same feelings at these restrictions on the Catholic body, as they do now on the African Slave Trade—when the only feeling they would create would be astonishment, that men who knew the value of freedom, and were proud of the possession, could have allowed prejudice or interest so to predominate, as to have supported two principles so abhorrent and detested [hear, hear!]. He was glad to witness in the debate of that night, no introduction of angry topics of recrimination. Too long had such recollections embittered our policy and produced a correspondent result. The true use of the errors past was to guard the future from their recurrence. Both parties had an interest in reconciliation—they had each much to forgive, and the common duty was to return to the paths of charity and concord. For himself he must say, that he had a selfish interest in the question. He felt that he was a Protestant, suffering under the restrictions imposed on the Catholic. As a subject of the empire, he called therefore on the Parliament of Great Britain to put him on an equality with his fellow subjects in England. These restrictions dis severed the natural ties of society in Ireland. They alienated from him, and from every Protestant Landholder, the otherwise natural attachments of their tenantry and neighbourhood [hear, hear!]. He spoke of the mass; he knew there were many great and splendid exceptions: but speaking generally, it was idle to deny that those restrictions prevented an attachment to the natural magistracy, a devotion to British connexion, and a respect for those laws, the protection of which was not equally shared between them [hear, hear, hear!]. The Honorable Member, amidst the continued cheers of the House, concluded with expressing his hope that the vote of that night would, by the removal of all civil disabilities, give at the same time satisfaction to the Catholics and security to the Protestants of the Kingdom [cheers].

Sir ROBERT WILSON made a few observations. He contended, that the best answer to those who asserted that the people of the Metropolis were adverse to those claims, was to be found in the fact, that no Anti-Catholic ground of preference was acknowledged by the Electors of London, Westminster, or Southwark, during the late elections. On former discussions of this question, when the subject was not so fully understood, Petitions signed by 68,000 persons were laid on the Table of that House, against concessions to the Catholics. Not a single Petition from that great and enlightened body was on the present occasion submitted to Parliament. Indeed, it was preposterous to think that after this country had restored or subsidized all the Popish Powers of Europe—after we made such struggles for their establishment, that we should turn round on our own countrymen, who co-operated in all our exertions, partook of all our sacrifices, and who contributed to the renown and glory of our arms, and deny them the participation of those constitutional securities which they so patriotically defended and helped to preserve.

Lord LOWTHER spoke a few words against further concession, as it tended to weaken the stability of the Protestant Establishment.

The House became clamorous for the question, and at length divided—

For Mr. Grattan's motion	241
Against it	243
Majority	2

A considerable discussion took place after the division, whilst we were excluded, in consequence of many Gentlemen having voted with the majority by mistake. On an explanation in the House, five votes were struck off from the majority (originally 243), and one from the minority.—Adjourned.

East India House.

FEBRUARY 4, 1819.

THANKS TO MR. ELPHINSTONE AND MR. JENKINS.

Immediately after the discussion on Mr. Campbell's letter, while strangers were yet excluded from the court, Mr. WEEDING rose to say a few words on a subject that appeared to him closely and indispensably connected with the Vote of Thanks which had been passed that day to the Officers of the British Army in India. He had been led to expect, from the speech of the learned gentleman (Mr. Randle Jackson) the day before, that it was his intention to propose a vote of thanks to the Hon. Mr. Elphinstone and Mr. Jenkins, Civil Servants of the Company, who in their character of political agents had so eminently distinguished themselves during the late campaign in India. Finding himself disappointed in this expectation, and the court about to separate, he could not suffer them to depart without making a few observations on the occasion. Filled with admiration, as he was, at the general proceedings and results of the campaign, he was particularly struck with the great merits of those gentlemen who had acted as political agents during that period. In the first rank of these stood the Hon. Mountstuart Elphinstone, of whom it might be truly said, as gathered from the public dispatches, that his peculiar praise was, "*tam Martiquam Mercurio*," being alike distinguished for heroism in battle as for wisdom in council. The records of the time informed them, that when it was no longer doubtful that the Peishwa was preparing the means of active warfare against the British interests in India, Mr. Elphinstone, with a promptitude and vigour that did honour to his judgment, invested Poona, the capital of the Peishwa, reduced him to submission, and compelled him to sign the treaty of the 18th of June 1817, by which he ceded to the East-India Company considerable territory, and several forts, as hostages for the maintenance of peace. Thus by a wise, prompt, and vigorous policy, did Mr. Elphinstone in a great degree disarm the enemy before he could mature his resources; and, in the language of panegyric this day bestowed in public thanks to the Governor General "materially lessened his means of future aggression."

Towards the close of the same year, 1817, open warfare took place: Mr. Elphinstone, now that his civil councils were no longer available, retired to the British camp, and was personally engaged in the memorable battle fought on the 5th of November, near Poona, in which two thousand eight hundred British and native troops defeated the whole of the Peishwa's army, consisting of twenty-five thousand. The words of Col. Burr, the commanding officer on that occasion, in his dispatches, are, "the Resident (Mr. Elphinstone) most gallantly exerted himself throughout the day, in setting a distinguished example of zeal and animation to the troops, encouraging the men whenever it became necessary, and aiding the commanding officer by his information and judgment." Here was the testimony of the commanding officer himself of the signal gallantry and valour which this gentleman displayed in the field, on an occasion too when such gallantry was of the last importance. Be it remembered that it was the first battle fought, and it is not too much to believe, that the victory with which it was crowned had the most favourable influence on the future operations of the campaign. Gained as it was against such great disparity of numbers, it gave encouragement and confidence to the British troops, while it spread dismay among the troops of the enemy. The Peishwa's army, panic struck, became from that time comparatively a fugitive and disbanded soldiery, and dissolved away before the persevering and gallant pursuit of Brig. Gen. Smith. Mr. Jenkins, also a civil servant and political agent of the Company, had shewn remarkable gallantry in a more partial affair near Nagpore, and had on many occasions, particularly during the late campaign, evinced great political sagacity and talent. He (Mr. Weeding) conceived, that while thanks were being dispensed for the achievements of the campaign, these gentlemen should not be overlooked. If any conduct were deserving of thanks, it was such gallantry and merit as they had displayed. For these reasons he should shortly move, "that the thanks of this court be given to the Honorable Mountstuart Elphinstone and to Mr. Jenkins, who, in their character of political agents, by their zeal, enterprise, and wisdom, contributed materially to the general success of the late campaign in India."

The Chairman having stated, that he hoped the hon. proprietor would not press the motion, being rather of an unprecedented nature, at so late a period of the day when many proprietors had left the court.

Mr. Weeding said, he should acquiesce; aware as he was that the court of directors entertained a high sense of the merits and services of Mr. Elphinstone in having appointed him to be governor of Bombay: he had nevertheless thought it a most fit occasion for the general court to testify their approbation also by a vote of thanks. For himself, he was so struck with the exalted nature of those services, that he could not resist the mention of it in open court.—Adjourned.

Allens.—The splendid representation of the remains of Athens, and the surrounding Country of Attica, now exhibiting in H. A. Barker and J. Burford's Panorama, Strand, will close early in April, to be succeeded by a Grand and interesting View of Venice, taken from the Square of St. Mark, in which will be introduced many thousand Figures, representing the celebrated Festival of the Carnival.

SONG OF LIBERTY.

Patriots rise! your country calls you,
Arm'd with Freedom's sword and shield,
Fearless of what fate befalls you,
Obey her summons,—to the field;
To fight,—to fall,—but not to yield.
Hark! the trumpet sounds to strike;
Hark! the war-horns' echoes swell.
Liberty! arise to life,
Tyrants tremble at your knell.
See! around her banners swarming,
March'd by the mourning drum,
What collected numbers arm,
Thick as ocean billows come;
A mighty tide of valour forming,
With hearts of fire, with crests of foam:
Impetuous course,—they come,—they come,
To sweep usurpers from their throne.

SONNET BY PETRARCH, WHEN ABSENT FROM LAURA;

Ye hours of pensiveness, how fair ye seem,
When kind ye bring that much-lov'd form to view;
Mild as the opening glance of Cynthia's beam,
With eyes of heavenly modesty tinted blue;
With locks that shame the morn's rich orient hue,
Down her fair neck in clustering wreaths entwined;
With look of elegance that speaks the mind,
Sweeter than Poet's pencil ever drew!
And Oh! those lips, chaste ripening rose-buds,—too,
Her cheeks, to which the pink's wild blush is given;
That bosom, throne of every virtue true;
That voice, whose harmony seems stol'n from Heaven.
Yes, pensive hours, ye cheer this heart awhile,
Like sun-beams glittering round some dark fall'n pile.

BLACK EYES AND BLUE EYES.

Love, wishing at length to terminate the long dispute which had existed between Black Eyes animated and sparkling, and Blue Eyes languishing and melting, published throughout his vast empire the following declaration:

Black eyes most dazle at a ball,
Blue eyes most please at evening fall;
The Black a conquest soonest gain,
The Blue a conquest best retain;
The Black bespeak a lively heart,
Whose soft emotions soon depart,
The Blue, a steadier flame betray,
Which burns and lives beyond a day;
The Black my features best disclose,
In Blue my feelings all repose:
Thé let each reign without control,
The Black all mind, the Blue all soul!

Original Anecdote of the late Bishop of Landeff.—The late Bishop Watson, shortly before his retirement, took lodgings in Cambridge, at a house adjoining an ale-house, the sign of which being Bishop Blaise, he was induced to compromise with the tavern keeper to take it down, as thinking it derogatory to the Episcopal dignity, which occasioned the following Epigram from Dr. Mansell, now Bishop of Bristol.

"Two of a trade can ne'er agree,"
No proverb e'er was juster;
They've pull'd down Bishop BLAISE, d'ye see,
And put up Bishop BLUSTER.

Anagram.—The following very extraordinary anagram is mentioned in M'Gregor's History of the War. The words *Revolucion Française*, by taking away the word *Veto*, will form, by an anagram, *Un Corse la finira*—A Corsican will finish it.

Advertisement.—The following curious advertisement appears in an American Paper, the Charleston Courier:—"This is to inform the Ladies of Charleston and the Public in general, that Mrs. Catharine Munro is arrived from her dear, dear native country (Scotland), and enjoys one of Heaven's greatest blessings (good bodily health). She is to be found at her residence in Hazel-street, when wanting."

To prevent the smoking of a Lamp.—Soak the wick in strong vinegar, and dry it well before you use it; it will then burn both sweet and pleasant, and give much satisfaction for the trifling trouble in preparing it.

O'SHERIDAN.

Sheridan's father one day decanting on the pedigree of his family, was regretting that they were no longer styled O Sheridan, as they had been formerly. Indeed, father, replied the late celebrated character, then a boy, we have more right to the O than any one else; for we *use* every body.